

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH      GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KUERELMEYER

## CONTENTS

STARCKE, TAYLOR.—Stefan George and the Reform of the German Lyric,	1
TOLMAN, ALBERT H.—Shakespeare Studies, Part III, - - - -	7
KRAPPE, A. H.—The Legend of the Glove, - - - - -	16
DRAPER, JOHN W.—The Social Satires of Thomas Love Peacock, Part II,	23
USHER, ROLAND G.—Francis Bacon's Knowledge of Law-French, - -	28
BROOKE, TUCKER.—'Titus Andronicus' and Shakespeare, - - -	32

**Reviews:—**

ROBERT K. ROOT, The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's <i>Troilus</i> . [J. Douglas Bruce.] - - - -	37
CHARLES M. GAYLEY, Shakespeare and the Founders of Liberty in America; MATTHEW P. ANDREWS, A Heritage of Freedom. [Tucker Brooke.] -	40
ROBERT M. GARRETT, <i>The Pearl</i> : An Interpretation. [Carleton Brown.]	42

**Correspondence:—**

ADAMS, JOSEPH QUINCY.—An "Hitherto Unknown" Actor of Shakespeare's Troupe? - - - - -	46
SHEER, GERTRUDE R.—More and Traherne, - - - - -	49
PHELPS, RUTH S.—Marino and Dante, - - - - -	51
COLLITZ, HERMANN.—M. H. G. <i>alrène</i> , - - - - -	52
HILL, RAYMOND T.—Old French <i>terne</i> , <i>ternir</i> , - - - - -	53
MASON, LAWRENCE.—Stray Notes on <i>Othello</i> , - - - - -	55
JENSEN, GERARD E.—The Covent Garden Journal Extraordinary, - -	57

**Brief Mention:—**

CARY F. JACOBS, The Foundations and Nature of Verse;—W. A. NELSON, Robert Burns: How to Know Him;—JAMES HOLLY HANFORD and JOHN M. STEADMAN, JR., <i>Death and Liffe</i> , - - - - -	59
---	----

**Necrology:—**

GUSTAV GEORGE LAUBSCHER, - - - - -	64
------------------------------------	----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Forty Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,

Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 2, 1918

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-  
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is  
\$3.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$3.25  
and \$3.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French, Italian, and Spanish Departments to Murray P. Brush. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

## OXFORD SPANISH PLAIN TEXTS

General Editor: J. FITZMAURICE KELLY

IRIARTE'S *Fábulas Literarias*. Fcap. 8vo (6½ x 4¼), pp. 78, limp cloth. 40c.

SAMANIEGO'S *Fábulas en Verso*. Fcap. 8vo (6½ x 4¼), pp. 146, limp cloth. 60c.

## OXFORD SERBIAN PLAIN TEXTS

Under the general editorship of Miss H. L. LORIMER

VECNOST, *NARODNA BAJKA*, napisao Janko M. Veselinovic. Crown 8vo (7¼ x 5). Paper. 40c.

## OXFORD RUSSIAN PLAIN TEXTS

General Editor: NEVILL FORBES

Crown 8vo (7¼ x 5), limp cloth

GONCHAROV'S *Men-Servants of Other Days*, edited by Nevill Forbes. Pp. 80. 60c.

KOROLÉNKO'S *In the Night, Easter Eve*, edited by Nevill Forbes. Pp. 96. 60c.

KRILOV: *Select Fables*, edited by E. G. Underwood. Pp. 64. 50c.

Complete catalogue upon request

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH  
35 West 32nd Street, NEW YORK

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

---

VOLUME XXXIV

JANUARY, 1919

NUMBER 1

---

## STEFAN GEORGE AND THE REFORM OF THE GERMAN LYRIC

In recent years the most powerful literary tendency that has been making itself felt is the revulsion against the realism of the last half century. The development of the Irish school of romanticists has had an important influence and the growth of the little theaters in this country is intimately connected with the revival of romanticism. Germany, too, has a large group of neo-romanticists who have been deluging the literary market with fantastic tales and tenuous dramatic productions. But none of these has outlined so careful a program or insisted with such vigor upon the acceptance of his principles as Stefan George, the Rhinelander. Born in 1869, he has the most vigorous years of his life already behind him, and yet it is but little more than a decade since Richard Meyer directed the attention of the public to his work. To speak of a public is rather to exaggerate the number of his readers. They are still relatively few and the seven or eight collections of his verse by their very outward aspect—binding, paper, and printing—appeal only to the select class which he wanted to reach. Indeed the poet is himself responsible for the scant attention which has been paid to him. With Olympian aloofness he wished to speak only to those whom he admitted to his guild and keep all others at a safe distance. Again and again he expresses his contempt for the mob, which, of course, includes the grubbing literary critic with his insatiate greed for unearthing sources and discovering "influences." To be sure, this pose, for thus it must be called, does not proceed from sheer scorn of the masses as such, but because he feels that the socialistic and collectivist tendencies of the day are of their very nature inimical to individual artistic creation. "Niemals war wie

heute eine herrschaft der massen, niemals daher die that des einzelnen so fruchtlos." <sup>1</sup> The poet must grow and develop far from the noisy babble of the world marts—*ein Talent bildet sich im Stillen*; the merest suggestion of professionalism in literature is a withering influence for delicate poetical growths. So George complains that the true poet is a thing of the past: "Die gestalt des dichters scheint den Deutschen ganz verloren gegangen zu sein. Es giebt jezt nur den gelehrten, beamten, bürger der gedichte macht und das schlimmste: den deutschen litteraten der gedichte macht." <sup>2</sup>

It was such considerations that impelled George and his disciples to gather behind closed doors and withhold their productions from the baneful influences of shallow literary critics. The meagre output of the school was published only for their own enjoyment in the privately printed *Blätter für die Kunst*,<sup>3</sup> which George proudly calls "die einzige dichterische und künstlerische *Bewegung*." The great mass of this is still inaccessible to the general reader and only selections have been reprinted in the three small volumes of the *Auslese* <sup>4</sup> by the venturesome Berlin publisher Bondi. The works which did not appear in the *Blätter für die Kunst* and the *Auslesen* were printed only in small editions. Even the publication of these volumes does not represent an abandonment of the earlier principles of an art for the few as the preface of the second volume explicitly states: the circle of the select has merely increased in size so that reprints and larger editions were desirable.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, George credits himself with having defeated the realists and

<sup>1</sup> *Auslese aus den Blättern für die Kunst*, II, 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Auslese*, II, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Published 1892 ff. by Bondi in Berlin.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. I, *Auslese aus den Jahren 1892-1897*; Vol. II, *Auslese, 1898-1904*; Vol. III, *Auslese, 1904-1909*.

<sup>5</sup> George's reserved attitude toward the masses is tempered by the admission that at times flashes of inspiration can be seen in the humbler man.

"Nur manchmal bricht aus ihnen edles feuer,  
Und offerbart dir dass ihr bund nicht schände."

*Teppich des Lebens*, Vorspiel, p. xiv.

"Manchmal kommt es dass in einem volke weisheiten dämmern für die das neue wort und die neue geste noch nicht ausgebildet sind. Das sind dann in der tiefe gewühlte erze die nicht ans licht gefördert werden können." *Auslese*, II, p. 21.



inaugurated a new era of poetic creation: "alles was heute unsere jüngste dichtung ausmacht (hat) hier seinen ausgang genommen oder seine anregung empfangen. Die bemängelnden richter entlehnen hier ihre maasse; die übriggebliebenen der wirklichkeitsschule glauben sich in den schönheitsmantel kleiden zu müssen und die hüter der alltagslebendigkeit schreiben 'stilvolle' sonette. Was man noch vor zwanzig jahren unmöglich gehalten hätte: heute machen bei uns Dutzende leidliche verse und Dutzende schreiben eine leidliche rede, ja das neue Dichterische findet wenn auch in der zehnfachen verdünnung öffentlichen und behördlichen beifall. Damit ist ein teil der Sendung erfüllt."\*

What is this mission that he thinks he has partially fulfilled? As far as the form of his work is concerned he shows an intimate relationship with the French Parnassians. Like them he strove to regain the polished form which had been lost through the centrifugal forces at work in the naturalistic productions; like them he was unalterably opposed to unchecked subjectivism, slipshod or repeated rimes and all looseness in poetic form. The ending of the line seems to have engaged his attention particularly and nowhere in German literature has such a variety of riming syllables been used. He goes to the extreme of maintaining that a rime once used loses its value for the poet and should seldom or never be repeated. The inevitable result of such an exacting rule was that innumerable obsolete words had to be resuscitated and curious compounds invented to satisfy the demands of the rime. He went to the extent of composing in Middle High German for practice in strict metrical form. But even then George found it impossible to obey to the letter the rules which he had himself formulated. The metrical forms in his poems show far less variety, the four line stanza of four or five feet riming *abab* or *abba* being the favorite. His most recent volume consists largely of poems in unrimed lines of five feet, mostly iambic pentameters. Whatever may be the deficiencies of his work through over-artificiality it cannot be gainsaid that he has enriched poetic diction by his revival of obsolete and Middle High German words.

Equally severe is he in his dicta respecting the content of the individual poem and the forms of poetic writing. A poem should be abstracted from the world of daily endeavor, free from theories

\* Vorwort, *Auslese*, 1904-1909.

of life and problems of state and society; it should be simple and clear and present objectively one single picture without the reflections and personal opinions of the poet. Wherever George has consistently adhered to this principle he has succeeded in creating lyrics of the greatest delicacy, particularly in his nature poems, as, for example, in the much quoted lines beginning: "Komm in den totesagten park und schau," which are so highly praised by Hofmannsthal. But this relentless application of the principle *L'art pour l'art*, this complete withdrawal into the rarified atmosphere of superworldly observation; the excessive condensation of the sentence attained through an inordinate use of genitive phrase; coupled with the demands made upon the reader's attention by a text almost bare of capitals and marks of punctuation—all this tends rather to obscurity than the limpid clearness for which the poet strove.

Not only did George draw narrow boundaries within which the lyric poem must revolve, but he also restricts poetry almost entirely to the lyric category. With the novel, especially the novel of the realistic type, he has no patience; "litterarische Reportage, Berichtserstatterei" he scornfully calls it. Toward the drama he maintains a more conciliatory attitude, but believes the stage of the present day to be barren of poetic productions. The drama has reached a point where, in his estimation, the dramatists are chewing their cud, existing on that which has been handed down through the generations and that they are writing for a theater with a tremendous machinery demanding plays written expressly for it. "Was wir jezt als bühnenwerke sehen ist bei den mindern schöpfungen eine verarbeitung nach dem muster der alten tragödie; bei den besseren ein lyrismus der zufällig in die gesprächsform gegossen wird."<sup>7</sup> It is the disuse into which verse has fallen in dramatic writing that is largely responsible for this condition: "Von einem halbgebildeten volke liess man sich belehren der vers habe die schauspielkunst vernichtet; man gewöhnte sich rhythm zu sprechen gleichsam um entschuldigung bittend und verlor damit jeden festen grund."<sup>8</sup> And so he sees the hopes for a rebirth of

<sup>7</sup> *Auslese*, II, p. 14. Compare also the remarks on the drama in *Blätter für die Kunst*, erste Folge, dritter Band, and *Auslese*, III, p. 10; likewise those of Karl Wolfskehl, *Auslese*, III, pp. 66-70.

<sup>8</sup> *Auslese*, II, p. 14.

the drama founded upon a restoration of the verse to its old place. To build the foundations for this new drama, for the drama receives furtherance rather through the coöperation of a group of poets with the same ideals than individual effort, he inaugurated a *Bühne der Blätter für die Kunst*. The object of this dramatic society was to give amateur performances in private houses in which particular attention should be paid to simplicity of grouping, æsthetic movements and to recitation ("abrichtung der stimme zum hersagen der neuen rhythmischen gebilde," *Auslese*, II, 13). George lays great stress upon this last point because the mannerisms arising from the stereotyped stage recitation have made all oral performances of poetry unrhythmical.<sup>9</sup> Specimens of dramatic compositions probably produced at these private performances may be found in the *Blätter für die Kunst*, as, for example, *Die Aufnahme in den Orden, ein Weihespiel*,<sup>10</sup> perhaps actually given at the initiation of a new member of the group.

George feels that it is his mission to recreate the world in a poetic sense, to develop a new power of joyous artistic contemplation. This conception is embodied in symbolic form in the *Vorspiel to Der Teppich des Lebens*. To the poet brooding in deep sorrow over his work there appears an angel strewing flowers—Art, and a dialogue ensues during which the poet seeks and receives consolation. He longs to regain the exaltation of youth and pleads stormily for Art's gifts so that he may overcome the discouragement of his isolation; but the angel gently restrains him with the admonition that his wishes are too wild and confused to be granted:

"Gewährung eurer vieler kostbarkeiten  
Ist nicht mein amt: und meine ehrengift  
Wird nicht im zwang errungen, dies erkenn!"

A strange intermingling there is here of confidence and joy in the ultimate success of his task and of terror at the difficulties that beset his path. Prayerful admiration of Hellenic art is contrasted with romantic pictures after the manner of Nietzsche in *Zarathustra*, as when he surveys from a mountain the mass of humanity struggling toward an unknown goal. It is the longest of his poems and the most obscure, but it contains the essence of his wishes and hopes for their fulfillment.

<sup>9</sup> *Auslese*, II, 42.

<sup>10</sup> *Auslese*, II, 42.

A careful study might reveal a strong Nietzschean strain in George's work; and indeed it is in one sense essentially that of a romanticist. The ever recurring *Sehnsucht nach der Sehnsucht*, the insistence on the unity of the arts, the glorification of night and sorrow; all this recalls to us the early romanticists. The list of his translations, which includes Rossetti, shows strong leanings toward this school and it is no mere accident that he, like Novalis and the Schlegels, is an ardent Roman Catholic. But, on the other hand, the avoidance of multiplicity of detail, the preference of classic outlines to the wild confusedness of a Brentano makes us hesitate before assigning him to his place.

Not all the members of the school let themselves be bound by George's narrow delimitation of the field of composition and we find Max Dauthendey writing novels and short stories like the rest of the professional litterateurs of the day. In George's review of the influence of his teachings on the literature of the present he refers somewhat bitterly to the defection of several of his disciples: "Man vergesse auch nicht dass die grenze des erreichbaren noch fern ist und dass die von diesem kreise abgesprengten die sich noch nicht zur gänzlichen entwürdigung ihrer muse entschliessen konnten vergeblich des beifalls harren. Das giebt denen die den tempel verlassen haben, in den vorhof ja auf die strasse geschritten sind eine mahnung sich wieder ins innerste zurückzuziehen, und alle die es mit unsrer kunst und bildung ernst meinen, werden sich der goldnen Blätter-regel aus der zeit ihrer morgenfrühe erinnern: 'dass nichts was der öffentlichkeit entgegenkommt auch nur den allergeringsten wert hat' und dass nur eines not tut: "ein weiter-schreiten in andacht arbeit und stille."<sup>11</sup>

None of the followers of George has done more than remotely approach him. Hugo von Hofmannsthal had only a distant outward connection with the school and has since gone his own ways. The inordinately self-centered Max Dauthendey's work is slipshod and uninspired in comparison with that of his former master. Richard Perls gave promise but died early, and of the others Paul Gerardy and Karl Wolfskehl perhaps stand out as most gifted. With these poets are associated also the artists Melchior Lechter and Ernst Gundolf, of whom the first prepared most of the decorations for the *Blätter für die Kunst* and the published works. How

<sup>11</sup> *Auslese*, III, *Vorrede*.



lasting the influence of the school will be remains for the future to tell.<sup>12</sup>

Smith College.

TAYLOR STARCK.

## SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

## III. THE EPIC\*CHARACTER OF HENRY V

In the play of *Henry V*, why does Shakespeare feel so intensely the limitations of the stage? The Choruses express this feeling very fully.

Can this cockpit hold  
The vasty fields of France? Or may we cram  
Within this wooden O the very casques  
That did affright the air at Agincourt?  
O, pardon! . . . . .  
Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts.

(Prologue-Chorus to Act I, 11-15, 23.)

<sup>12</sup>The following bibliography of works and articles on George may be acceptable since it is at present difficult to gather information about the poet. The literary histories of Albert Sörgel, Kummer, and Vogt and Koch, and L. Lewisohn's *The Spirit of Modern German Literature* also contain short articles:

Kuno Zwymann, *Das Georgesche Gedicht*, Basel, 1902; Hugo von Hofmannsthal, "Über Gedichte," *Neue Rundschau* xv (1904), 129-139; Franz Dulberg, *Stefan George. Ein Führer zu seinem Werke*, München, 1908; E. Bertram, "Über George," *Mitteilungen der literarhistorischen Gesellschaft Bonn*, Dortmund, 1906, III, No. 2; G. Brandes, "Stefan George: Neue Poesie," *Wiener Zeit*, October 9, 1903; H. Ubell, "Stefan George," *Das literarische Echo*, 1904, pp. 1201-1204; E. Felder, "Stefan George," *Die Gegenwart*, 1904, No. 52; K. W. Goldschmidt, "Stefan George," *Das literarische Echo*, 1906, pp. 1493-1500; B. Baumgarten, "Stefan George," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1907, Vol. 128, pp. 428-469; F. Wegwitz, "Stefan George," *Westermanns Monatshefte*, July, 1911, pp. 659-664; W. Scheller, *Die Gegenwart*, 1912, No. 23; F. Kuntze, "Die innere Form der Lyrik Stefan Georges," *Kunstwart*, May, 1913, p. 280; E. Bertram, *Mitteilungen der literarhistorischen Gesellschaft Bonn*, VIII, 1-23; H. Benzmann, *Die Lichtung*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 485; Marie von Bunsen, "Stefan George: der Dichter und seine Gemeinde," *Vossische Zeitung*, Berlin, 1898, No. 2, Sonntagsbeilage; H. Eick, "Drei Briefe über Stefan George," *Hamburger Correspondent*, 1908, Beilage No. 23; W. K. Stewart, "The Poetry of Stefan George," *The Dial*, LXIII, 567-570; Ludwig Klages, *Über Stefan George*.

And so our scene must to the battle fly,  
 Where—O for pity!—we shall much disgrace  
 With four or five most vile and ragged foils,  
 Right ill-dispos'd in brawl ridiculous,  
 The name of Agincourt. Yet sit and see,  
 Minding true things by what their mockeries be.  
 (Prologue-Chorus to Act iv, 48-53.)

Thus far, with rough and all-unable pen,  
 Our bending author hath pursu'd the story,  
 In little room confining mighty men,  
 Mangling by starts the full course of their glory.  
 (Epilogue-Chorus, 1-4.)

Shakespeare had commented humorously in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* upon the lack of reality in stage-presentation. Here he is troubled also by the lack of grandeur.

The dramatist was not oppressed by the inadequacy of scenic representation in the earlier *I Henry IV*. There the action shifts about between London, Northumberland, Northern Wales, and Shrewsbury. In the later *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* we readily accept the transportation of armies over much greater distances than in *Henry V*. Here the short journey from London to Southampton is carefully indicated:

The King is set from London; and the scene  
 Is now transported, gentles, to Southampton.  
 There is the playhouse now, there must you sit.  
 (Prologue-Chorus to Act II, 34-36.)

One explanation of the passages cited is that the dramatist has gradually come to feel the unreality and inadequacy of stage-presentation for the large movements of a historical play. With the exception of his portion of *Henry VIII*, *Henry V* is the last drama of Shakespeare that sets forth well-authenticated English history.

*Henry V* was quite certainly written in 1599. Ben Jonson's comedy *Every Man in his Humour* was acted in 1598. The doctrine that comedy must "show an image of the times" was plainly implied in this realistic play. That the characters were at first given Italian names was a foolish following of the romantic fashion of the period, and English names were afterwards substituted. We know not when the Prologue was written that was first printed in 1616. This Prologue expresses the demand for realism in comedy

with great force; and it may well be aimed at some of Shakespeare's plays which contained the romantic audacities that Jonson disliked. The Chorus of *Henry V* seems to receive especial notice. Jonson will not

with three rusty swords,  
And help of some few foot and half-foot words,  
Fight over York and Lancaster's long jars,  
And in the tiring-house bring wounds to scars.  
He rather prays you will be pleas'd to see  
One such to-day, as other plays should be;  
'Where neither chorus wafts you o'er the seas,  
Nor creaking throne comes down the boys to please;

. . . . .  
But deeds, and language, such as men do use,  
And persons, such as comedy would choose,  
When she would show an image of the times,  
And sport with human follies, not with crimes.

(Ll. 9-16, 21-24.)

There is doubtless some truth in the suggestion that Shakespeare was influenced by the realistic movement of which Jonson was the most notable representative; but this fact, and the historical nature of *Henry V*, are probably not the only reasons why the limitations of the stage were felt so very acutely in connection with this piece. I believe that there is a more important and more fundamental explanation; I believe that Shakespeare is irritated by the smallness and the inadequate equipment of the stage in presenting his *Henry V* because he wishes to idealize and glorify his hero. His drama is one only in outward form; in essence it is a heroic poem. He is using the dramatic form for an epic purpose. In presenting his hero he aims primarily at epic glorification, not at dramatic reality.

Critics characterize dramas as "epic," in whole or in part, for various reasons. At times a play seems to be called epic in nature because it presents several different stories.<sup>1</sup> Also, narrative passages in dramas are often spoken of as epic portions. The General's report at the beginning of *The Spanish Tragedy* concerning the war just ended between Spain and Portugal, is such a passage; so is the account of his voyage which Hamlet gives to Horatio (v, ii.). In this use epic is only a synonym for narrative. The

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama*, I, 282.

German adjective *episch* has this meaning.<sup>2</sup> The International Dictionary does not recognize at all the tendency to look upon *epic* as equivalent to *narrative*. Epic, both as adjective and as noun, is there applied only to a heroic narrative. The poetry of the *Iliad*, of the *Aeneid*, or of *Paradise Lost* is epic; ordinary narrative poetry is not.

It is in this stricter sense of the word that I apply it to *Henry V*, and speak of the epic character of the drama. The impulse to admire, the delight in hearing of noble heroes and mighty deeds, is the fundamental desire of the human heart to which epic poetry appeals. In sympathy with the great action and the grand style of the epic poem, the tendency is to represent everything as pleasing and remarkable, and to put the characters before us as wholly admirable. We see brave men and fair women stepping with lordly tread amid beautiful surroundings. Even the common acts of daily life have a halo thrown about them; they are given dignity and significance.<sup>3</sup>

It may seem at first sight that there is more of glorification in *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* than in *Henry V*, since creatures of the unseen world mingle in the action and enhance its significance. There is some force in this as applied to the setting of the plays. But *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* themselves are presented as struggling men, now hopeful, now despondent. *Macbeth* is a sinner. But *Henry V* is a complete hero. He always knows his own mind, and usually feels confident about the mind of God; his courage never wavers; his helpless enemies make haste to fall before him. Let us note different ways in which the epic nature of this play comes to distinct expression.

The six Choruses are the outstanding feature of this play. They are essentially epic. The first words show that their purpose is to glorify the great hero and the mighty action.

O for a Muse of fire, that would ascend  
The brightest heaven of invention,  
A kingdom for a stage, princes to act,  
And monarchs to behold the swelling scene!

<sup>2</sup> "Epische Poesie und erzählende Poesie sind gleichbedeutend." C. Beyer, *Deutsche Poetik*, 2te Aufl., II, 24. Stuttgart, 1887.

<sup>3</sup> See the admirable passage in ten Brink's *Lectures on Shakespeare*, Holt, 112-18.



Then should the warlike Harry, like himself,  
Assume the port of Mars;

(Prologue-Chorus to Act I, 1-6.)

If this drama were of the ordinary type, these Choruses could only serve to take the life out of the action by outlining it in advance. Especially is this true of the passage explaining beforehand the conspiracy of II, ii. To suppose that the spectator needs the help of the Chorus before Act II in order to pass in imagination from London to Southampton is absurd. The most telling of the Choruses, that before Act IV, bridges no interval of space or of time. Though there are effective bits of realistic portrayal in that Chorus, this is only because these strokes help to exalt the character of Henry. The magnifying, glorifying character of these Chorus additions to the play is manifest, and shows their essential purpose. They are epic, not dramatic.

The close of the Chorus before Act III is emphasized by what may have been, as Miss Charlotte Porter suggests,<sup>4</sup> a new device of the new Globe Theatre. A reference to cannon in the words of the Chorus is accompanied by a simultaneous discharge of "chambers."

. . . the nimble gunner  
With linstock now the devilish cannon touches,  
*Alarum, and chambers go off.*  
And down goes all before them.

(Ll. 32-34.)

No wonder that Garrick when presenting this piece chose the Chorus for his own part. In the revival of the play by the late Richard Mansfield, perhaps the most satisfactory feature was the spirited rendition of the Choruses by a gifted young woman.

The absence of all internal struggle and all development of character in King Henry is undramatic. This epic hero appeals to our admiration more than to our sympathy. To some extent the spectacular element seems to be intended to compensate for this absence of inner striving and character-growth. Mr. Snider notes the "tendency of the drama to turn panorama—to change from inner development to outer spectacle."<sup>5</sup> The accent on spectacle explains the fact that "Three centuries after the play

<sup>4</sup> Introduction to the play in *The First Folio Ed.*, Crowell, pp. xv-xvi.

<sup>5</sup> *The Shakespearian Drama, The Histories*, p. 41. St. Louis, 1889.

was first produced, one of the greatest of American actors [Richard Mansfield] almost ruined himself financially in the attempt to give it a fitting revival."<sup>6</sup>

Henry's heroic character is not to be impaired by any unfavorable view of his attempt to conquer France. He solemnly charges the Archbishop of Canterbury to tell him the unvarnished truth concerning his right to the French crown. Bradley says: "When Henry adjures the Archbishop to satisfy him as to his right to the French throne, he knows very well that the Archbishop *wants* the war because it will defer and perhaps prevent what he considers the spoliation of the Church."<sup>7</sup> The text does not make it clear that Henry knows this; and I question whether we should attribute to King Henry motives which nowhere come to expression.

The conspiracy of II, ii, was the logical beginning of the Wars of the Roses, which had already been dramatized in *Henry VI* and *Richard III*. The real purpose of the plot was to gain the crown for Edmund Mortimer Earl of March, brother-in-law of one of the conspirators, the Earl of Cambridge. By strict primogeniture Mortimer was the lawful king. Later, Edward IV and Richard III, grandsons of this Earl of Cambridge, sat upon the throne. Holinshed is full and clear here; but we are not allowed to learn anything of all this. No enemy of Henry is to have any reasonable ground for opposing him. "The gold of France" has bribed the conspirators; we are not told distinctly of any other motive. Also, the intense dramatic suspense which might have been given to the rôle of the young King at this point is deliberately sacrificed. The Chorus-Prologue has told us the story in advance; and Henry is made a godlike creature, a complete hero, calmly knowing all, forestalling every hostile purpose, and pronouncing judgment.

An extravagant bit of glorification comes in IV, viii, where the list of the Englishmen slain at Agincourt is given as four men of rank and twenty-five common soldiers. This estimate is taken from Holinshed, who promptly adds: "But other writers of greater credit affirm that there were slain above five or six hundred persons."

This ideal king is made honor-loving and daringly brave.

<sup>6</sup>J. W. Cunliffe in *Shaksperian Studies*, 331. Columbia Univ. Press, 1916.

<sup>7</sup>In *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*, 257. Macmillan, 1909.

If we are mark'd to die, we are enow  
 To do our country loss; and if to live,  
 The fewer men, the greater share of honour.  
 God's will! I pray thee, wish not one man more.  
 By Jove, I am not covetous for gold,  
 . . . . .  
 But if it be a sin to covet honour,  
 I am the most offending soul alive.

(iv, iii, 20-29.)

Henry's care to protect the French people is, also, an engaging feature.

We give express charge, that in our marches through the country, there be nothing compell'd from the villages, nothing taken but paid for, none of the French upbraided or abused in disdainful language; for when lenity and cruelty play for a kingdom, the gentler gamester is the soonest winner (iii, vi, 114-20).

Shakespeare's glorification of the English nation suggests an ideal at one point that has not even yet been fully attained. In the latter part of iii, ii, four officers, an English captain, a Welsh, a Scotch, and an Irish, appear side by side as loyal and efficient fellow-soldiers. This is Shakespeare's prophecy of a unified Great Britain. This portion of the play is not present in the Quarto, and it is probably an addition to Shakespeare's original text, since a long passage in i, ii, is very bitter toward the treacherous Scotch, and the Chorus before Act v speaks of Ireland as in rebellion when the lines were penned.

Henry's ardently religious nature is not allowed to impair his epic serenity. He confesses a sin—but it is his father's:

Not to-day, O Lord,  
 ●, ~~not~~ to-day, think ~~not~~ upon the fault  
 My father made in compassing the crown!

(iv, i, 309-11.)

We have seen too many modern examples of the combining of piety and slaughter to feel sympathetic toward all the manifestations of Henry's bellicose religiosity; but his modest reply to the brave, pedantic Fluellen is engaging:

*Fluellen.* All the water in Wye cannot wash your Majesty's Welsh blood out of your pody, I can tell you that. God pless and preserve it, as long as it pleases His grace, and His majesty too!

*K. Henry.* Thanks, good my countryman.

*Fluellen.* By Jeshu, I am your Majesty's countryman, I care not who know it. I will confess it to all the 'orld. I need not to be ashamed of your Majesty, praised be God, so long as your Majesty is an honest man.

*K. Henry.* God keep me so!

(iv, vii, 111-21.)

The most original portions of the play, iv, i, and iii, are also the strongest and most successful. In the first of these scenes the King goes in disguise among the common soldiers, learning their sentiments and inspiring them with his own dauntless courage. This is the life-giving feature of the play. This incident also connects most closely with all Henry's past career. Through the half-concealed face of the disguised King, as he talks with the soldiers, gleam the features of the jesting Prince Hal of Eastcheap, able to "drink with any tinker in his own language." Shakespeare wisely lets the young King show a troubled spirit as he remembers how his father obtained the crown. Henry is admirable here, but not in an over-colored way. He is a hero, but he is also a living man.

The genuinely democratic spirit of iv, iii, is finer still. Henry speaks for all:

And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,  
From this day to the ending of the world,  
But we in it shall be remembered,  
We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.  
For he to-day that sheds his blood with me  
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,  
This day shall gentle his condition.

(Ll. 57-63.)

Those who object to the manner in which Henry woos Katherine may well be asked to indicate how it could have been managed better. The fact that he won his wife in France could not be ignored, yet he must impress us to the end primarily as the conquering soldier. His robust wooing is effective upon the stage. Effective too in its ironic way is the fact that the child of Henry and Katharine, the "boy, half French, half English, that shall go to Constantinople and take the Turk by the beard," was in reality the weak Henry VI.

Certain features of the play impair the epic grandeur of the hero-king. The command of Henry to kill the prisoners, at the close of iv, vi, and the threat to kill other prisoners at iv, vii, 66, are probably looked upon by Shakespeare as a necessary concession



to historical accuracy. The savage threats against Harfleur in III, iii, bring about its surrender, but Henry's words practically condone the outrages that he threatens. Kreyssig is led to speak of a brutal strain in the Anglo-Norman race, "which seems to come to life again in the practices of some of the inhabitants of North America, like a long-preserved grain of wheat planted in favorable soil."<sup>8</sup>

The unwise depreciation of the French is fatal to the best interests of the play. What glory can come from conquering such opponents? The play shows no real conflict, either inward or outward.

The ideal king here presented is so aggressively English that he cannot completely enlist the sympathies of other nations. Thus, while Miss Porter calls the strenuous speech in III, i, beginning "Once more unto the breach, dear friends," "the supreme battle-speech of Literature," Brandes declares that "King Henry's two speeches before Harfleur [III, i, and iii,] are bombastic, savage, and threatening to the point of frothy bluster."

It is interesting to note a general agreement and also a contrast between Shakespeare's own life and that of Henry V, his "ideal of active, practical, heroic manhood" (Dowden). Like that hero, the dramatist won practical success against great obstacles. But it shows real catholicity of mind that Shakespeare seems to admire especially in Henry the power of accomplishing great results in the real world, because this was so different from his own imaginative and ideal achievements.

The play as a whole has been much criticized for its dramatic deficiencies. Some of these judgments seem somewhat narrow and academic. Sturdy Dr. Furnivall declares that "a siege and a battle, with one bit of light love-making, cannot form a drama, whatever amount of rhetorical patriotic speeches and comic relief are introduced."<sup>9</sup> Professor Brander Matthews says of the play: "It is a mere drum-and-trumpet history, with alarums and cannon-shots, sieges and battles, the defiance of heralds, and the marching of armies. As a specimen of play-making it is indefensibly artless."<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Vorlesungen über Shakespeare*, 3te Aufl., I, 257. Berlin, 1877.

<sup>9</sup> *The Leopold Shakspeare*, p. liv. Cassell, 1877.

<sup>10</sup> *Shakspeare as a Playwright*, 122-23. Scribners, 1913.

Is not the play criticized in the passage last cited for not hitting a mark at which it does not aim? Shall we call the Choruses, for example, "indefensibly artless"? I admit that they are distinctly non-dramatic. And while Dr. Furnivall's criticism is true for us, it is well to remember that the play was not made for us. That *Henry V* is not a real masterpiece, completely effective for all men and for ever, must be admitted. But this play should not be judged entirely from a dramatic standpoint. The drama was made for man, not man for the drama. The Prince who has interested us in three preceding plays is here presented as the young hero-king. Our admiration is appealed to more than our sympathy. The purpose and effect of the piece are more epic than dramatic. This epic song to the glory of England and England's hero-king, written and acted about a decade after the defeat of the Armada, undoubtedly drew crowds to the new Globe Theatre, and quickened the patriotism of every man who saw and heard it. The crowds paid well, and that also was intended. When examined in the study by a spectacled twentieth century scholar, the play easily gets out of focus. While we apply our critical measurements and standards, we easily forget the mighty communal and national appeal which brought the great throngs together, and which thrilled and satisfied them.

ALBERT H. TOLMAN.

*The University of Chicago.*

---

### THE LEGEND OF THE GLOVE

In his introduction to Lope de Vega's play *El Guante de Doña Blanca*<sup>1</sup> Menéndez y Pelayo gives an account of the history of this motif upon which the play is partly based; it is the well-known legend of the glove, which has become famous through Schiller's ballad *Der Handschuh*. It could be summarized as follows: From motives of pride a lady induces a knight who has courted her for a long time to bring her back a glove which she had dropped into a lion's cage; the knight performs the deed, escaping unhurt, but punishes the lady by striking her in the face. The Spanish origin

<sup>1</sup> *Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española*, tomo ix, Madrid, 1899. *Observaciones preliminares*, pp. lxxxv-xcii.

of the legend has been known for many years.<sup>2</sup> Menéndez y Pe-  
layo gives nine different versions as found in Spanish literature  
of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and Fr. Thiel mentions  
five.<sup>3</sup> Neither of these scholars mentions another allusion con-  
tained in the fifteenth scene of the first act of Lope's play *La Portu-  
guesa y dicha del forastero*.<sup>4</sup> There Celia tries to persuade Don  
Félix to postpone his departure. The passage reads as follows:

Pues bien, ¡un día os altera,  
Que perdéis por una dama!  
¿De qué gigante, qué fuerza,  
Las doncellas me librásteis?  
¿Qué guante de la leonera  
Habeis sacado por mí?  
Qué moro muerto en la guerra!  
Si hoy perdísteis la jornada,  
Mañana podréis hacerla.

Thiel<sup>5</sup> brings out the fact that the legend came to form the  
subject-matter of the thirty-ninth tale of the third part of Ban-  
dello's *Novelle*, published at Lucca in 1554,<sup>6</sup> without trying to  
ascertain the direct source of the Italian. In his introduction to  
the story Bandello asserts he heard the subject from the account  
of a Catalan named Valenza. The indications which the author  
is in the habit of giving in the introductions to his stories are gen-  
erally considered as untrustworthy. With the great influence the  
Spaniards exercised upon Italian courts after the battle of Pavia,  
and with a Spanish dynasty ruling over Naples, an oral source  
would at least not be improbable. However this may be, it is im-  
possible to come to a definite opinion for the time being, since  
exceedingly little has been done to discover the sources of the  
Italian novelist. What we can determine are the changes the story  
has undergone when entering this new stage of its history. Doña  
Ana de Mendoza has become Leonora. The outcome is no longer

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Fr. Thiel, *Der Handschuh*, Leipzig, 1881, 82-87; Liebrecht, *Schiller, Der Handschuh, Germania*, VII (1847), 419; Adolf Laun, *Eine altspanische Romanze zur Vergleichung mit Schillers Handschuh*, *Schnorrs Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, I (1870), 507.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 77-79 and 82-87.

<sup>4</sup> *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, XXXIV, 161.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 72-76.

<sup>6</sup> Matteo Bandello, *Le Novelle*, a cura di Gioachino Brognoligo, Bari, Laterza, 1911, IV, 363-367.

a happy one, for the knight leaves the lady after having punished her. Lastly, the story is connected with another one, that of the seven Moors. The first two changes are obviously the work of Bandello. The reason for the second change becomes clear when we consider the general morality of Bandello's stories, which is characterized by Tiraboschi with the following words: "Prese in Boccaccio la oscenità e vi lasciò l'eleganza." As a matter of fact, with Bandello all the monastic-ascetic elements have given way before the pagan ideals of the Renaissance. The happy ending of the Spanish must have appeared disagreeable to this "jouis seur," who hardly approved of ladies imposing proofs of valor of such a doubtful character upon their lovers, without being more severely punished than was the case in the Spanish ballad. It is utterly unlikely that a version with this different outcome should have existed in Spain without leaving any trace in Spanish works. As for the third change, we must suppose Bandello to have had as a source a Spanish version in which there existed already the combination of the two adventures. A passage in the *Infierno de Amor* by Garci-Sánchez de Badajoz, quoted by Menéndez y Pelayo,<sup>7</sup> as well as the verses of Lope mentioned above, make this perfectly clear.

Bandello's version of the story was copied *literally* by Francesco Sansovino and incorporated in his collection called *Cento Novelle Scelte*,<sup>8</sup> where it forms the second story of the tenth day.

When and under what circumstances the legend came to Germany is not known yet. Thiel<sup>9</sup> mentions several compilations containing the story, without entering upon the problem of determining the sources. The collection *Wendunmuth*<sup>10</sup> was compiled by Hans Wilhelm Kirchhof, whose life as a "landsknecht" led him to many parts of Germany, and several times to France, where he took part in the religious wars. The sources of the work are still

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. lxxxvi-lxxxvii.

<sup>8</sup> *Cento Novelle scelte da' più nobili scrittori della lingua volgare*, di Francesco Sansovino, nelle quali piacevoli e notabili avvenimenti si contengono. Di nuovo reformato, rivedute, e corrette. Venezia, A. de Vecchi, 1597.

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 88-90.

<sup>10</sup> *Wendunmuth*, von Hans Wilhelm Kirchhof, herausgegeben von Hermann Österley, Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, Tübingen, 1860, xcv, 68.



in large part unknown. Our story forms the fifty-ninth tale of the first volume. The action is practically the same, only the instigator is no longer a lady, but a German prince, the victim his knight. The outstanding feature of the story is the moral contained in the little verse at the end:

Unmöglich anmutung der herrn  
Macht abscheuwliche diener gern.

We shall find a similar moralizing tendency in the French translation of Belleforest, with the only difference that the French moralist points out the ingratitude of ladies. Yet in the medieval German mind *Herrendienst* and *Frauendienst* are supposed to be about the same as far as their disadvantageous consequences for the servant are concerned. There is an old German saying testifying to this attitude:

Herrengunst, Aprilenwetter,  
Frauenlieb' und Rosenblätter,  
Würfel-, Karten-, Federspiel  
Verändern sich oft, wer's glauben will.

Thus it would not be altogether improbable to suppose a French source, the version of Belleforest, accepting the possibility that Kirchhof converted the lady into a prince, owing to the fact that he himself seems to have had more than one occasion to complain of the ingratitude of *Herrendienst*.

In 1559 Boaistuau, a Breton nobleman, translated twelve stories of Bandello's collection into French, giving his work the title of *Histoires tragiques*. It was continued by François de Belleforest, who translated fifty-three more stories, which he published in three volumes till 1570. The tale of Giovanni Emanuel figures as the eighteenth story of volume 4 of Belleforest's collection.<sup>11</sup> The method followed by Belleforest in his translation has been discussed in a general way by René Sturel,<sup>12</sup> the results of whose investigations are fully confirmed in the particular case of this story, as will be seen from the following lines. In the translation it is four times as long; while the action remains practically the

<sup>11</sup> *Histoires tragiques* extraites des œuvres italiennes du Bandel et mises en langue Française, Par François de Belle-forest, Comingeois. Tome Quatrième, A Rouen, Chez Pierre Calles, 1604.

<sup>12</sup> *Bandello en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, *Bulletin italien*, XIII (1913), 210 ff. and 331 ff., XIV (1914), 29 ff., 211 ff., 300 ff., XV (1915), 2 ff., 56 ff.

same as in the Italian original, the translator indulges in all kinds of digressions, as ridiculous in their character as they are harmful from the view-point of the artist. Here are a few examples illustrating the procedure of the French writer. Bandello contents himself with giving Seville as the scene of the action, putting it in a gerundial clause: "essendo la Corte in Seviglia." Belleforest gives a long description of the Spanish court, narrating that it had moved from "Medinne" to Seville, adding that the latter was then the capital of the Spanish kingdom, a fact highly indifferent for the understanding of the story. Then he tells that the knight had accompanied the king, not because his duty as a courtier required it, but solely for the love of his lady. When stating the fact that King Ferdinand kept some lions in a cage, he asserts that kings and men of power have generally a taste somewhat different from that of the vulgar. Thus he shows his mental superiority and greater knowledge on all possible and impossible occasions, the worst mistake a novelist can commit. But this is not all; he has changed the action as well. The scene of the knight punishing the lady, which would have been too shocking for Belleforest's society, was omitted and replaced by a tiresome discourse. Likewise, the character of Leonora is different from the Italian model. While in the latter her motive was mere frivolity, hers is a most perverse character in the French translation. She sends the knight down into the cage, hoping that the lions might rid her of him for good; for "elle l'eust voulu sçavoir en l'isle de Cuba en la nouvelle Espagne, pour n'avoir plus un si fascheux reveille-matin pour luy rompre la teste."<sup>13</sup> Later, when he comes back safe and secure, she regrets that the lions had had their meal before she had sent him down. The reason of the change is obvious: Belleforest, a moralist of Puritan character, wished to inveigh against the vanity of the young courtiers of his time. This moral purpose can be seen in the very title of the story. Bandello writes: "Don Giovanni Emanuel ammazza sette mori ed entra nel serraglio dei lioni e ne esce salvo per amor di donna."<sup>14</sup> Belleforest translates: "Un chevalier espagnol se met *follement* au hazard pour acquerir la grace d'une demoiselle, puis, recognoissant *sa folie* se depart *sagement* de sa poursuite."<sup>15</sup> It is interesting to note that Belleforest

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 615.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 364.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 597.

as a true Frenchman tries to bring in analysis of character, where the Italian model showed nothing of that sort. When the hero, after having performed the courageous deed, mounts the steps to return to the lady, the change that is going on in his heart is described with the following words:<sup>16</sup> "Mais montant les degrez il s'auisa de toutes ses folies passees, & des dangers où desia par deux fois il s'estoit mis & expose pour cette folle qu'il cognut lors estre plus que traistresse & malicieuse, cherchant ainsi les moyens qu'elle faisoit pour le faire mourir." Above all, Belleforest's love of long discourses and rhetoric pierces through everywhere. In order to express the fact that the knight has been cured of his love, he has recourse to Ulysses and Circe, Timon of Athens, Renaud de Montauban, Tristan and King Mark; his hero breaks forth in a long monologue, and finally writes a long poem, which he causes a friend of his to hand over to Eleonore.

Of an infinitely higher quality is the treatment of the same subject by Brantôme. Speaking Italian and Spanish with equal facility and being in favor with the Spanish and Italian courts, it may be assumed with an equal degree of probability that he got the subject from an Italian or Spanish source. As a matter of fact, Sanvisenti<sup>17</sup> supposes the latter, while most of the other critics accept the former of the two possibilities. When comparing the version of Brantôme with Bandello's short story, we find some textual agreements, so that there can be no doubt as to the true source of Brantôme's account. The French author ascribes the heroic deed to the Chevalier de Lorge, a knight at the court of Francis I, and captain of the Scottish body-guard of the king. He was the father of the unlucky Montgomery who killed Henry II in a tournament, was persecuted by Catherine of Medicis, turned Protestant, took part in the civil wars, was taken prisoner and executed in 1574 in the presence of the court. Montgomery had two brothers, Corbozon and Lorges, who were both intimate friends of Brantôme.<sup>18</sup> The story was inserted in the *Discours sixiesme, sur ce que les belles et honestes dames aiment les vaillants hommes, et*

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 616.

<sup>17</sup> *Il Guanto dello Schiller, Rivista d'Italia*, 1904, I, 666.

<sup>18</sup> Ludovic Lalanne, *Brantôme, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Société de l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1896.

*les braves hommes aiment les Dames courageuses*,<sup>19</sup> with the obvious purpose of pleasing the author's friends and their family, upon whom the glory of the courageous deed of their father would naturally be reflected. Nor do we need to be astonished at the stratagems Brantôme used to disguise the fact that he was actually plundering a writer who was still living or had not been dead for many years, when the "Discours" was written, as proceedings of this sort were quite common at that time. Moreover, we cannot deny the skill he displays on this occasion as on many others. The story of the Moors has been omitted, the time is no longer that of Ferdinand and Isabel, but that of Francis I, the scene has moved from Seville to Paris, the knight Giovanni Emanuel has become the captain of the Scottish body-guard, and his merciless sweetheart is no longer Leonora, but a lady whose name Brantôme feigns to conceal for discretion's sake. Naturally, he does not say: "I found the story in Bandello's *Novelle*," but he starts with the dignified phrase: "J'ay ouy faire un conte à la Cour aux anciens d'une Dame qui estoit à la Cour, etc."<sup>20</sup>

Now we have seen that about the same time Belleforest translated the story, and the question arises: Did Brantôme know of this translation? If so, did he use it? At first sight one would be inclined to give an absolutely negative answer, so great is the difference between the bombastic account of the moralist and the excellent, remodelled story of the courtier, for from the artistic viewpoint Brantôme's version is even superior to the Italian original. With a few but well-chosen words he depicts a whole situation, there is no discourse, no moralizing in his story. The rudeness of the knight in the final scene has been done away with partly, since it has been put in a clause starting with "On dit." Still, there are a few words which suggest the possibility of Brantôme's having at least known the work of Belleforest, which was widely read in court circles.

Brantôme's account is generally considered as the source of Saint-Foix, who in his turn suggested the subject to Schiller. This is the place to mention the error Sanvisenti commits<sup>21</sup> in supposing that Schiller could not have found anything else in Saint-

<sup>19</sup> *Œuvres complètes de Pierre de Bourdeille seigneur de Brantôme*, publiées par Ludovic Lalanne, Paris, Renouard, 1876, ix, 390.

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 390.

<sup>21</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 666.

Foix, except the anecdote of Pippin the Short, and that Brantôme's version must, therefore, be considered as the direct source of the German poet. There is no need for such a theory, since the account of Brantôme, somewhat abridged, is found in Saint-Foix's *Essais historiques sur Paris*.<sup>22</sup>

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

*The University of Chicago.*

## THE SOCIAL SATIRES OF THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK

### PART II

Peacock stands aloof from all political alignment. Condemning as he did the society of his day, he obviously could have been neither a conservative Tory nor even a moderate Whig. One might, therefore, suppose him a radical, like his friend Shelley; but the facts contradict such a hypothesis. In 1819, when his career as a satirist was just under way, he accepted a post in the India House. In the first place, if he were a radical, he could scarcely have taken a semi-government position without all his radical friends making at least private remonstrance against this apostasy—especially as they made such an ado over the "apostasy" of Southey and Wordsworth. In the case of Peacock, nothing of the sort happened; Shelley, in fact, writes congratulating him on being so well provided for (Ingpen, pp. 697 and 710). Had Peacock ever been a radical, Shelley certainly could not have voiced such sentiments. In the second place, Peacock, at this time and afterwards, continues to attack the "lakers" for their apostasy—a thing he would scarcely have had the face to do, had he but lately played apostasy in exactly the same fashion to exactly the same cause. Peacock, then, had never been a radical, and indeed never became one. He represents them in a light at once antipathetic and ludicrous: insincere faddists, they all cry each his own panacea, recommending to society a nostrum whose efficacy the vendor himself has never tested. Then finally came the Reform Bill of 1832, which Peacock considered bootless, a fitting summary to his opinion of reforms and reformers. In short, after looking about him and seeing society corrupt, he turned his eyes to the intellectual life that was moulding the

<sup>22</sup> *Œuvres complètes de M. de Saint-Foix*, Paris, Duchesne, 1778, III, 183 ff.



future, and saw that also corrupt: such is the social pessimism of Thomas Love Peacock.

In the first place, the motives Peacock assigns to reformers are low. Shelley, he seems to have looked upon as an impractical dreamer; at least, so Shelley himself interpreted Peacock's burlesque of him as Scythrop (Ingpen, p. 694), and Shelley's interpretation seems accurate; but Peacock credits reformers, in general, with no idealism, however impractical. As sentimentalists, as chasers after novelty, as bilious malcontents, thus Peacock sees the reformers of society. The failure of the French Revolution, which had turned the "lakers" into conservatives, embittered many radicals of the succeeding generation; and this bitterness manifested itself emotionally in the *Weltschmerz*, a point of view with which Peacock's keen, intellectual pessimism had little in common, and of which he had a very poor opinion: Mr. Hilary, whom Peacock draws as the most common-sense character in *Nightmare Abbey*, explains the *Weltschmerz* as "frequently the offspring of overweening and mortified vanity, quarreling with the world for not being better treated than it deserves" (p. 188). Mr. Flosky, a caricature of Coleridge, explains that the "blue devils" dominate contemporary literature because "tea has shattered our nerves and late dinners make us the slaves of indigestion" (p. 173 et seq.). Mr. Listless, moreover, finds that "this delightful north-east wind . . . delicious misanthropy and discontent that demonstrates the nullity of virtue and energy" (p. 164) puts him in a very good humor with himself and his sofa. In short, whether the cause of the pessimistic unrest be late dinners and tea or wounded vanity, it all comes to one conclusion: Peacock considered these men actuated by only private motives, not by any high idealism based in a comprehensive understanding of social wrongs. Mr. Flosky sums up *Nightmare Abbey* (p. 210) with an admirable satiric touch: "Let society only give fair play at one and the same time, as I flatter myself it is inclined to do, to your system of morals, and my system of metaphysics, and Scythrop's system of politics, and Mr. Listless's system of manners and Mr. Toobad's system of religion, and the result will be as fine a mental chaos as even the immortal Kant himself could ever have hoped to see; in the prospect of which I rejoice."

For reformers so actuated to be sincere is a psychological contradiction; thus, Peacock is perfectly consistent in preferring this

charge to their motives and incompetency to the resultant efforts. In *Headlong Hall*, each avowed deteriorationist refuses to apply the theory to his own particular specialty (pp. 87-88). Mr. Escot, the champion of vegetarianism, while defending his attitude, begs the dinner-guests not to launch into the question of final causes—and meanwhile helps himself to a slice of beef (pp. 18-19). Poor Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey afford shining targets for every satire up to *Gryll Grange*; and Peacock in *Nightmare Abbey* (p. 237) cast a jocose reflection upon even Scythrop's (Shelley's) sincerity: he plans to "make his exit like Werther," calls for "a pint of port and a pistol" for dinner—and ends by drinking the port.

Finally, in 1830, when the Whigs on a reform platform, carried a majority in Parliament, Peacock had a chance of testing his low opinion of their sincerity. The ten years that intervened between this and *Nightmare Abbey* and *Headlong Hall* had not lessened his skepticism; for, in *Crotchet Castle*, written in 1830 and published the following year, the Rev. Dr. Folliott thus characterizes the new ministry in the person of "my learned friend" Lord Brougham who had just been made Lord Chancellor: "He will make a speech of seven hours duration; and this will be its quintessence: that, seeing the exceeding difficulty of putting salt on the bird's tail, it will be expedient to consider the best method of throwing dust in the bird's eyes" (p. 304), the bird being the liberal constituencies of England. In short, he believed that the reformers in power would prove just as conservative as the Tories. In the same novel, he even turns upon reform itself as a means of medicining the nation's deep-seated ailments: the three charity commissioners who sit and discuss for ever and ever without doing anything are surely meant to point the social paralysis of the state to achieve any adequate reform. When in 1832, the Reform Bill, timid as it was, was finally forced through Parliament, Peacock seems to have been no better pleased. The old abuses have merely taken on new names; the old insincerity has, like a spring, merely gushed out at a new place. In 1837, five years after the passage of the Bill, he pens a preface to a fresh edition of his novels: "*Headlong Hall* begins with the Holyhead Mail, and *Crotchet Castle* ends with a rotten borough," he writes. "The Holyhead Mail no longer stops at Capel Cerig Inn, which the progress of improvement has thrown out of the road; and the rotten boroughs of 1830 have ceased to

exist, though there are some very pretty pocket properties which are their worthy successors. But the classes of tastes, feelings, and opinions, which were successively brought into play in these little tales, remain substantially the same. Perfectibilians, deteriorationists, statu-quo-ites, phrenologists, transcendentalists, political economists, theorists in all sciences, projectors in all arts, morbid visionaries, romantic enthusiasts, lovers of music, lovers of the picturesque, and lovers of good dinners, march, and will march forever, *pari passu* with the march of mechanics, which some facetiously call the march of intellect. . . . The array of false pretensions, moral, political, and literary, is as imposing as ever." Peacock believed that the Reform Bill accomplished nothing; and, in his last novel, *Gryll Grange* (p. 3), published in 1860 when Peacock was a full blown reactionary, he still renews this charge of insincerity: "In my little experience, I have found . . . that men who sell their votes to the highest bidder and want only 'the protection of the ballot' to sell the promise of them to both parties, are a free and independent constituency; that a man who successively betrays everybody that trusts him, and abandons every principle he ever professed, is a great statesman, and a conservative, forsooth a *nil conservando*, etc."

Peacock hoped nothing from reformers either in office or out: the fundamental failings of human character that lay behind the rottenness of family, church and state, permeated likewise even the medicines that should have cured them. Like Helvetius, his conception of human nature was pessimistic; but, unlike the latter, he knew enough to realize that a mere change of political and social institutions could not effect a millennium, that the fault is inherent in man himself. Shelley recognized this when he wrote addressing Peacock: "you who assert the supremacy of Ahriman," the Persian god of evil. The failure of the French Revolution to reform man by changing the state and society, had taught succeeding thinkers that evil is deeper than these; and Peacock sharing as he does the rationalizing outlook of the preceding age, stands an eighteenth century man, pre-natally disillusioned by the failure of eighteenth century philosophy. Unlike his contemporaries who took refuge in the sentimental *Weltschmerz* which they expressed in the lyric cry that characterized the literature of the age, Peacock turned skeptic, and sharpened his arrows to shoot folly as it flew.

Although Peacock's thought is primarily rationalistic, he borrows

his explanation as to how this wretched situation came about, largely from Rousseau. Mr. Forester in *Melincourt*, for whom Peacock seems to have a special preference, describes this racial degeneration: "Civilization, vice and folly, grow old together. Corruption begins among the higher orders, and from them descends to the people; so that in every nation the ancient nobility is the first to exhibit symptoms of corporeal and mental degeneracy" (p. 97), the stature of the human race, we are told, has decreased (p. 269); and "Commercial prosperity is a golden surface, but all beneath it is rags and wretchedness," to which last is added the quotation from Rousseau: "Man has fallen never to rise again" (p. 128). Mr. Forester becomes the *pater familias* to an ideal, Rousseauistic commonwealth on his estate. But however much Peacock may sympathize with this scheme, he evidently realizes the impossibility of its universal application; for he makes Mr. Fax point out that it is "adapted only to a small community and to the infancy of human society" (p. 301), and Sir Telegraph, upon being belabored by Forester to give up the noxious and unnatural habit of carriage-driving, replies: "When ecclesiastical dignitaries imitate the temperance and humility of the founder of that religion by which they feed and flourish: when the man in place acts on the principles which he professed while he was out: when borough electors will not sell their suffrage; nor representatives their votes: when poets are not to be hired for the maintenance of any opinion: when learned divines can afford to have a conscience: when universities are not a hundred years in knowledge behind all the rest of the world: when young ladies speak as they think, and when those who shudder at a tale of the horrors of slavery will deprive their own palates of a sweet taste, for the purpose of contributing all in their power to its extinction:—why then, Forester, I will lay down my barouche" (p. 194). In short, Peacock thought society too complicated, and men too insincere, to make a return to the Golden Age possible. This, however, did not keep him from an occasional ecstasy upon Nature in *Maid Marian*, nor from bitter satire of the advance of the arts and sciences in the masque that concludes *Gryll Grange*. Happiness, truth, and sincerity could come, then, only in a primitive society, for the return of which, Peacock had no hope.

Society was rotten to the core, family, church, and state; reformers were actuated by low motives, were insincere and incom-

petent; society was grown too unwieldy and too corrupt for a return to the days of happiness and truth: so does Peacock affirm the intellectual pessimism and social bankruptcy of an age struggling—vainly it seemed—to solve its acute economic, political, and social problems. He illumines the shadow-land between the Romantic and the Victorian high-lights; and, indeed, the roots of his thought reach back into the eighteenth century; whereas his final novel discusses the progress of science so lately displayed in the industrialism that shocked Ruskin and the biological materialism that alarmed Matthew Arnold. He is an invaluable register of the thought of this transition, a period which few of the Romantic poets lived long enough to experience, but which Peacock has summarized in a series of delightful, penetrating satires. Some such conclusion must have moved Saintsbury in the last of his introductions, thus to define the place of Peacock: "The English Muse seems to have set, at the joining of the old and new ages, this one person with the learning and tastes of the ancestors, with the irreverent criticism of the moderns, to comment on the transition; and, having fashioned him, to have broken the mould."<sup>1</sup>

JOHN W. DRAPER.

*New York University.*

#### FRANCIS BACON'S KNOWLEDGE OF LAW-FRENCH

It seems not to be as well known as it should be that among his many and various accomplishments Francis Bacon included an unusual command of Law-French. What I am concerned to demonstrate is not merely an ability to read Law-French—any black-letter lawyer would declare that a man who had been Treas-

<sup>1</sup> List of works used:

Freeman, A. Martin, *Thomas Love Peacock, a Critical Study*. London, 1911.

Gummere, F. B., *Democracy and Poetry*. New York, 1911.

Hartley, L. Conrad, "Thomas Love Peacock," *The Manchester Quarterly*, xxxiv (1915), 256 ff.

Ingpen, Roger, *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. London, 1909.

Paul, Herbert, *The Nineteenth Century*, LIII (1903), 651 ff.

Peacock, Thomas Love, *Novels* edited by George Saintsbury. New York and London.

Van Doren, Carl, *The Life of Thomas Love Peacock*. London, 1911.



urer of Gray's Inn, Solicitor General, and Attorney General would necessarily be familiar with the peculiar language (or shall we call it jargon?) in which the entire learning of English law was couched. At that date literally nothing, whether year-book, abridgement, or report, was available in English. The very dictionaries were in Law-French. Nor was it an unusual feat to be able to write and take notes in "the language of our law." But the mixture of French, Latin, and English employed by most lawyers of the time was a crass compound, void of form, structure, regularity, or grammar,—the result of abysmal ignorance of all three languages. From a man of Bacon's admired Latinity, fluent French, and extraordinary grasp of English, we have a right to expect, as we find, a truly distinguished Law-French, possessed of structure, of euphony, and of rhythm. At the same time, it may not be literally possible to demonstrate these qualities to those who lack familiarity with the scarcely Frenchified English of the majority of Bacon's contemporaries, to say nothing of the marvelous diction of Sir Edward Coke<sup>1</sup> and of the Frowyck's and Hengham's of the Golden Age of the language.<sup>2</sup>

No great attention has been paid to Bacon's own praise of Law-French or to the fact that he intended to publish the body of the *Maxims* in that tongue.<sup>3</sup> Presumably the reason is that the edi-

<sup>1</sup> The first editions of Coke's *Reports* were all issued in Law-French and represent his diction when he had full opportunity for revision. These cannot be fairly compared with Bacon's mss. There are in Harleian mss. 6687, A, B, C, D, note-books containing Coke's casual jottings about legal and personal matters, entirely in Law-French and Latin. In the Holkham mss. in the library of the Earl of Leicester, are several papers in Coke's holograph which can also be fairly compared with Bacon's casual Law-French and which show Coke's extraordinary command of that tongue.

<sup>2</sup> While Professor Maitland has reconstructed the Law-French grammar of the Middle Ages, no such service has been performed for the sixteenth century. The changes are very radical and it is therefore not possible to judge the correctness of Bacon's usage or its fluency except in comparison with what we judge to have been the usage of his peers, from relatively brief and unscientific studies.

<sup>3</sup> "For the expositions and distinctions, I have retained the peculiar language of our law, because it should not be singular among the books of the same science, and because it is most familiar to the students and professors thereof, and besides that it is most significant to express conceits of law; and to conclude, it is a language wherein a man shall not be enticed to hunt after words but matter." Spedding, Ellis, and Heath, *Works*, VII, 322.

tions of the *Maxims* we have, as well as the manuscripts, are all in Latin and English.<sup>4</sup> Bacon intended them for lawyers only; the publishers after his death sought to reach a wider audience. In any case, no work of his was printed in Law-French and the mss. in that tongue he left were tossed aside by editors and students, intent from the first upon the philosopher and English stylist. The fact even that he wrote in Law-French, habitually used it in his legal work, seriously undertook to publish a polished and finished work in it, was so little emphasized that it became practically forgotten.

A holograph ms. exists, however, entirely in Law-French—Harleian mss. 7017, f. 179—which is of great interest. The chirography belongs to the very earliest period, and, coupled to other evidence, makes probable a date as early as 1586 or 1587. If correct, this ms. is the earliest known work from his pen (if we except dubious ascriptions) and is certainly his earliest holograph treatise. Nor are the facts without interest that it is not in English and that it is neither literary nor philosophical, but technical law of the toughest, relating indeed to a subject which was to the ordinary practicing lawyer of Bacon's day a matter of curiosity and of antiquarian interest. It is soon to be published by the present writer, with much other unpublished material by Bacon, and its content need not further concern us here. Its form, however, is of interest to students of literature and a few quotations will serve to illustrate the language and to convince the reader of the truth of Bacon's defense of the use of the language for the text of his *Maxims*. The matter is as unintelligible to the average man in English as in Law-French.<sup>5</sup>

Tous terres et biens dans le Royaulme que ne poynt estre pretend  
ou challenge de nullorum sont al Roy. Come si foundor d'un abby  
mour sans heir et puis l'abby est dissolue le Roy aura la terre.<sup>6</sup>  
Issint si tenant in tail grant totum statum suum per fine et le  
conisee mour sans heir le Roy aura la terre; Issint si tenant pour

<sup>4</sup>The earliest printed edition is 1630; the only ms. copy with a date is 1630; and all the ms. copies have been copied, "edited," and "improved" by inexpert hands, with insertions and additions which Bacon expressly tells us are contrary to his intentions.

<sup>5</sup>We have every reason to believe that Law-French was not the spoken language of the courts; but when spoken, it seems to have been pronounced like English.

<sup>6</sup>Most of Bacon's contemporaries would have written "le terre" and have used the present tense of the verb.

vie fait feoffment sur condicon et cesty en reversion release ad feoffee et puis le tenant pour vie enter pour le Condicon infrent et mour, le Roy aura la terre.<sup>7</sup>

chescun sute vers le Roy doet estre tiel que convent oue la dignitie ou majesti royall: Ideo nul sute par le Comen ley mais par peticon Supplicat humillime Altudini vostri et le peticon et monstrance de droit sont done par statute.<sup>8</sup>

Uncore est dit 22 E. 3 que ab antiquo le Roy fust sue come common person et que E. 1. ordeine le Contrary et introduce petition et Wilby dit qu'il avoit vieu brief Precipe Henrico Regis; mais Brooke object que le Roy ne poet faire precipe destre vers luy mesme et uncore qui non habet superiorem potest regulariter esse Judex in causa propria. Brooke auxi fait que si tielz briefs ne furent award par le Cunstable d'Engleterre. Mais il n'ad aucun probability que en temps plus proche al Conquest quand le gouvernement fust plus marshall et plus absolute, que le prerogative seroit plus foible et Ideo semble que ceo est conceit et erroneous; ou que ceo fust en le tumultuous tems de H. 3 solement et Jhon [sic] et nient auant ny depuis et que l'ordonnaunce E. 1. si aucun fust, fust de toller le abuse, et in 24 E. 3. bro. dit.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> A translation may not be amiss. All lands and goods in the kingdom to which no one has or claims title belong to the crown. Thus if the founder of an abbey die without heir and then the abbey is dissolved, the Crown shall have the land. So if a tenant in tail grant his whole estate by fine and the cognizee die without heir, the Crown shall have the land. So if a tenant for life makes a feoffment on condition and the cestui in reversion releases to the feoffee, and then the tenant for life enters on the aforesaid condition and die, the Crown shall have the land.

<sup>8</sup> Every suit against the Crown must be such as is agreeable to the royal dignity or majesty: therefore no suit at Common Law but by petition most humbly begs your royal highness and the petition and monstrance de droit are awarded by statute.

<sup>9</sup> On the other hand it is said in [the Year Book] 22 E[dward] III that in olden time the King was sued [in the courts] like his subjects and that E[dward] I ordained the contrary and introduced the [practice by] petition and Wilby said that he had seen a writ of praecipe [issued by] King Henry [III]; but Brooke argues that the King could not issue a praecipe against himself and again that he who has no superior may in law be judge of his own case. Brooke also queries whether such writs were not issued by the Constable [Justiciar] of England; but there is no such probability at a date nearer to the Conquest [by William] when the government was more military and without appeal to ordinary courts; when too the prerogative was less strong; and therefore it seems [to me] either that this is mere opinion and bad law; or that it was [true] of the disorderly times of H[enry] III and John only and neither before nor since, and that the ordinance of E[dward] I, if such there was, was to toll [i. e. to stop] the abuse, and on [the Year Book] 24 E[dward] III Bro[oke] comments [this Bacon left for a later day.]

One further brief example possesses a certain humor.

Est praerogative le Roy d'aueir les plus excellent choses en tous species Come Lyones et Elephants qui sont beasts royall. Eagles et Ostriches. quaere de porpusses.

It will be remembered that these phrases are in Bacon's holograph and represent notes taken for his own use, either in legal work, or more probably, in accordance with his known habit, as a first draft of some treatise to be polished and finished at leisure. It is his familiar use of this language which is of interest. Without long disquisitions and innumerable comparative quotations, it is not possible to demonstrate the allegation that his Law-French possessed a firmness of structure, an elegance of form, a variety of vocabulary, a precision and exactitude of usage rare at that date. The declensions and conjugations had long since been dropped and we shall not therefore find Bacon at variance with the usage of his day, but he regards the singular and plural of the subject and verb as related one to the other; he is exact in his use of connectives, observes the common French genders, and is sparing of English words, except where they have been incorporated into the Law-French and possessed a technical meaning, or where he attempted remarks of a nature not common in law books and therefore without a recognized terminology.

ROLAND G. USHER.

*Washington University.*

---

#### TITUS ANDRONICUS AND SHAKESPEARE

The modern public is so pitifully receptive of new theories regarding Shakespeare—as the so-called 'Baconian' and much other literature attests—that it becomes obligatory on serious students of the poet to make no frivolous use of their special opportunity. That is why I feel that Mr. H. D. Gray has almost broken trust in his recent discussion of the authorship of *Titus Andronicus* (Flügel Memorial Volume, 1916). Mr. Gray's theory is, so far as I know, and by his own statement, quite unique. He explains it at once:

'The proposal I have to submit is, that Shakespeare was the original author of the piece, and that such un-Shakespearean

passages as we find in it are due to the revision of his work by other men [*viz.*, Greene and Peele].'

It is a startling conclusion, affecting the fundamentals of the poet's dramatic development and allowing the student, however weary in his effort to keep up with the march of Shakespearean research, no choice but to read it. It is human to feel relief at finding that Mr. Gray's paper extends to but a dozen pages. Five thousand words are not many in which to establish so revolutionary a theory, and the inference is natural that Mr. Gray must have discovered documentary evidence of some decisive kind. No such thing, however, appears: there is nothing in the way of recorded fact that is or purports to be new. In the absence of fresh information, one is likely to expect a critical interpretation of the old, but again one is surprised. Mr. Gray's method is ingenuous and the reverse of technical. He ignores even the amenity which prescribes that disputants in a case of doubtful authorship begin by laying the bibliographical evidence fairly before their readers. No mention is made of the early editions or notices in Henslowe and the *Stationers' Register*, though much of this material is certainly pertinent and, it seems to me, adverse to Mr. Gray's thesis. Instead, the author begins with a lunge that is apt to scandalize precisians in the critical game:

'We are accustomed to think of Shakespeare as having served his apprenticeship in revising older plays. What we ought to have supposed all this time is that the Stratford youth of dramatic bent composed several original and unactable plays before ever he sought his fortune in the world; that he came to London in the hope of disposing of them; and that *his* work was handed over to the established playwrights of the time for *their* revision. . . . A moment's reflection should convince anyone that the work of none of these men [*i. e.*, Kyd, Marlowe, Greene, and Peele] would have been handed over for revision to this unknown youth from up Stratford way. If a young man to-day wished to make his entry into the theatrical world, he would write several plays and submit them; but he would not be given the work of Pinero, Jones, Shaw, or Barrie to revise.'

This sophomoric assumption of identity between modern and sixteenth-century conditions baffles me: Mr. Gray simply cannot believe that conditions were the same or even similar. He certainly



knows that it was a regular thing for obscure writers to revise the work of the greatest, for Birde and Rowley to amplify *Doctor Faustus* and 'Bengemy Jonson' in his days of servitude to produce additions to the *Spanish Tragedy*—even later, in all human probability, for works of Shakespeare's maturity like *Macbeth* and *Timon* to be handed over to dramatic journeymen. Moreover, on the very next page, Mr. Gray belies his own assertion by unquestioning acceptance of Shakespeare's employment as reviser of *Henry VI*. If a moment's reflection should convince any one that *Titus Andronicus* (on the assumption that it was written by Kyd, Marlowe, Greene, or Peele) would not have been 'handed over for revision to this unknown youth,' why does not the same reflection forbid Mr. Gray to assume that *Henry VI* (ascribed to one or more of the same writers) was so handed over? Yet he says: 'Shakespeare's claim to very extended passages in this [*ex hypothesi*, as reviser; see Mr. Gray's context] is of course undoubted.'

Mr. Gray proceeds to remark that 'The external evidence in favor of Shakespeare's authorship is overwhelming.' Ignoring all the external evidence except that of the Folio editors and of Meres, he continues his method of proof by pure assertion. Heminge and Condell printed the play, and 'these friends and "fellows" of his knew whether or not Shakespeare was the author.' Meres, who gives *Titus* as one of Shakespeare's plays in 1598 'was an educated man addressing an enlightened audience; he had his facts well in hand—he even knew of the private circulation of the Sonnets [Q. E. D.].' Of course, the evidence of the Folio editors and of Meres is very important on the general question of Shakespeare's concern in the play, but how does it prove Mr. Gray's peculiar contention that Shakespeare was the original author? Mr. Gray is fain to admit that the inclusion of the work in the First Folio 'implies only that the play was largely Shakespeare's,' but he affects to think the Meres mention more pertinent. 'The reason why Meres did not include either *Henry VI* or *The Taming of the Shrew* was, I firmly believe, that he knew (and many of his readers would know) that Shakespeare was only the reviser of these plays. If my contention as to *Titus* is right, then Meres' record is clear; he included every play of which Shakespeare was the original author, and, appropriately, none which he had only revised.' Mr. Gray invites us first to accept on the basis of his 'firm belief' (not further developed) a highly conjectural theory of Meres's motives,

and then offers us the clearing of Meres's record as a reward for adopting a new notion concerning the authorship of *Titus* which is in harmony with his conjectural theory. This is distressingly fallacious in itself, and leads at once to a further difficulty which Mr. Gray appears to have overlooked. Suppose we grant—as I think few readers of the *Palladis Tamia* will wish to do—that Meres was so perfectly informed and so admirably logical in excluding plays that Shakespeare revised, what shall we do with *King John*, which immediately precedes *Titus* in his list? Shall we not be obliged by simple analogy to conclude that Shakespeare wrote the original *Troublesome Reign* and Green, Peele & Co. the revised work?

I shall not follow Mr. Gray in his arraignment of various current theories on the authorship of *Titus Andronicus*, to which he next turns and to which he devotes over half of his article. Much of it does very well, but none of it advances his own idea. I cannot indeed find in his paper any effort after the second page to come to grips with the argument he is championing; namely, that Shakespeare was the original author, not the reviser, of the play. Only once again does he really venture into the open—when he seeks to show that the proportion of double-endings in *Titus* (estimated at 7%) proves its Shakespearean authorship. He is here headed toward a *non-sequitur*, since successful identification of Shakespeare's style in *Titus* would prove Shakespeare originally responsible for the plot and structure (as Mr. Gray thinks) precisely as little as the undoubtedly Shakespearean style of *King John* establishes his claim to the original plot and structure of that work. However, it would be highly important if Shakespeare could be shown by the double endings to have had any large concern in *Titus Andronicus*, whether as reviser or otherwise; but Mr. Gray's use of statistics fills me with incredulity. His argument is that Shakespeare must have written the play because neither Greene, Peele, nor Marlowe could have written a drama with seven per cent. of double endings. Rather than quarrel with this despotic subjection of Elizabethan drama to an absolute quadrumvirate, let us look at his mode of eliminating the three undesirable candidates. I have not had the spirit to check up Mr. Gray's percentages for Greene and Peele, beyond counting fourteen double-endings in the first act of *The Battle of Alcazar* (which verifies Robertson's figure of nearly 6%), where Mr. Gray asserts there are but four. It is Mr. Gray's

unqualified statement about Marlowe which most outrages me: 'Marlowe *never* employs the double ending as frequently as Shakespeare *always* employs it.' This, I am sure, can be disproved by comparing much of Shakespeare's early work, whether act, scene, or entire play, with *Edward II*, which has seventeen indubitable double-endings in the last three hundred lines and nine in the 120 lines of the king's death-scene (seven and a half per cent). Mr. Gray's own figures are four per cent. for *King John*, five for *Love's Labor's Lost*, six for *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and three and eight-tenths for *Edward II*. I think Mr. Gray is not ignorant that the percentage in Marlowe's *Lucan* is about sixteen and in his portion of *Hero and Leander* about ten. Whether his very low proportion of double-endings for the entire play of *Edward II* can be justified on any fair basis of calculation I have not freshly investigated. I do not think so, since it varies decidedly from my own count, which does not differ from the rules that Mr. Gray states. Nor am I in any way desirous of establishing the possibility of Marlowe's authorship of *Titus Andronicus*. But is it not strange that a scholar should be willing to rest a categorical denial of the possibility solely upon the asserted presence in the play of a percentage of double-endings which Marlowe unquestionably equaled in some of his most characteristic scenes, which he more than doubled in blank verse narrative, and exceeded by half in riming couplets?

In a year or little over it has been my task to read papers by Mr. Gray on *Titus Andronicus*, on Falstaff, on *Hamlet*, on the first part of *Henry VI*, and on *Love's Labour's Lost*. Ill considered 'snap-judgment' and logical inconsequence are not observable to the same degree in all, but if a strong family resemblance did not seem to exist, this protest would hardly be registered. Shakespearean research is now pretty soundly established in America. Half a dozen scholars to whom the present writer doffs his cap are with cautious laboriousness stalking the elusive game which escaped such ardent hunters as Malone, Halliwell, and Furnivall. Is it invidious for those who follow in the chase to raise a cry of deprecation, when it looks as if the whole range might be disturbed by random pot-shots?

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

## REVIEWS

*The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus.* By ROBERT KILBURN ROOT. Published for the Chaucer Society. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., and Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1916 (for the issue of 1912).

It has been known for some time past in professional circles that Professor Root had in preparation an edition of the *Troilus and Criseyde*, and the present publication puts before us the fruits of his thorough-going investigations into the primary question as to what should be the textual basis of his proposed edition. The result is a textual study of great interest in which the main problems involved have, in the opinion of the present writer, found a satisfactory solution, although, as will be seen below, the author's final suggestion as to the best basis for a critical edition of the poem is hardly in accord with his own solution of these problems.

The *Troilus* has been preserved in sixteen MSS., of which two are incomplete. Moreover, two early prints—Caxton's *editio princeps* (about 1483) and Thynne's first collective edition of Chaucer's works (1532)—present texts that are independent of the MSS. now extant, and hence have a textual authority which is equal to that of the MSS. Professor Root first describes these various authorities in detail, and then in five successive chapters studies the manuscript relations for each of the five Books, respectively, that make up the poem. The basis of this study, as he explains in his preface, is "a minute examination of about 2500 lines chosen from all parts of the poem after a more cursory comparison of the authorities in their entirety. The lines chosen for careful study include: (1) the stanzas printed in the Chaucer Society's volume of Specimen Extracts; (2) the whole of the soliloquy on free choice in Book iv; (3) all lines in which there is a significant variation found in two or more MSS.; (4) all lines in which there is a variation, however slight, affecting the two main types of text,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , or the important group designated as  $\gamma$ ."

It will simplify the understanding of Professor Root's results, if I state at once that, according to his very convincing analysis, Chaucer turned over to a professional scribe the first (autograph) rough draft of the poem to transcribe, and, when the transcription

was returned to him, corrected in it the errors which the scribe was sure to have introduced. This corrected copy, which, of course, is no longer extant, is the archetype of the mss. of the so-called  $\alpha$  group. Chaucer, however, himself kept this archetype in his possession and used it for revising and rearranging his work, writing new lines or phrases in the margin or between the lines. From this archetype in its final state of revision were derived the mss. of the  $\beta$  group, which are related to each other "only in that they are derived from Chaucer's archetype in its latest stage of revision." There would be this difference, then, between a ms. of the  $\beta$  group and one of the  $\alpha$  group. A scribe, who was transcribing the  $\beta$  original (which was the  $\alpha$  ms. after Chaucer had completed his progressive revision and correction of it) would often have before him more than a single reading. He would have in many cases the old reading—cancelled, to be sure—as well as the new reading. Then, in other instances, this  $\beta$  original, owing to corrections Chaucer had made, would, very likely, "present a confusing, if not illegible text." Every scholar knows, I may remark, what problems we often create for the typists of the present day, when we have introduced considerable alterations into the mss. which we submit to them. In cases where the earlier reading had been cancelled, but still remained legible, the copyist, through inadvertence or wrongheadedness, might, after all, transcribe this earlier reading. These conditions, furthermore, might give rise to conflate earlier readings. That is to say a copyist, not understanding altogether some indicated revision, might incorporate in his copy part of the revised and part of the unrevised reading. The whims and blunderings of individual scribes, when confronted with these allurements to error which revision had created, would, of course, differ very much—hence the confusion that is observable in the relations of the  $\beta$  mss. A collation of the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  mss. shows that the changes which Chaucer instituted in his revision are confined to comparatively limited areas. In Book I the variations are mainly found in the first 500 lines, the most important being the presence of stanza 128 in the  $\alpha$  mss., which is not found outside of that group. In Book II, there are very few striking variations, save in ll. 701-1113, and in Book V there are virtually none, save ll. 1807-1827, about the flight of Troilus's soul to heaven, taken from the *Teseide*, which were added later. It is in Books III and IV that the groups exhibit the greatest differences. In the former Troilus's song of love,



ll. 1744-1771, seems to have been a later insertion. Stanzas 190 and 191, too, which in the first draft followed l. 1323, were moved down to a position immediately preceding l. 1415, and ll. 1323, 1415 and the first line of the shifted passage were then altered to suit the new relations. These are merely the most marked variations of Book III. In Book IV variations of equal significance are found, the most important being the long soliloquy on God's foreknowledge and man's freedom of choice, ll. 953-1085, of which there is no indication in the *a* mss.

One might expect to find the mss. of the *β* group representing different grades of revision, but it results from Professor Root's examination that such is not the case. They all represent copies made after the revision was complete.

Perhaps, the greatest divergence between the views of Professor Root and previous editors of Chaucer as to the relations of the *Troilus* mss. concerns the place among these mss. of the so-called *γ* group. According to McCormick, Preface to the Globe edition, p. xli, "the *γ* type represents a later copy, either carelessly corrected by the author, or collated by some hand after Chaucer's death." The fact that this group includes half of all the surviving mss. and that some members of the group, like the Campsall ms. and the Corpus Christi (Cambridge) ms., No. 61, are "beautifully executed and exceptionally free from errors of their own" has, in Professor Root's opinion, exercised an undue influence over the judgment of editors, *e. g.*, Professor Skeat. As a result of a searching examination of the question, however, he has, himself, concluded—and, I believe, justly—that the *a* group has no claim to the position which is assigned it in the words quoted above from the Globe edition. The errors which are summarized, pp. 251 f., prove that all the mss. of this group are descended from a common ancestor which could not have received Chaucer's correction and sanction. At the time that this archetype of the group was executed, Chaucer had not finished the revision of the poem which is represented by the *β* group. He had revised it only in part.

These are the main points, I believe, which Professor Root's researches have substantially established. There are others of less significance, of course, which we need not emphasize here, *e. g.*, the fact that some mss. are of composite origin, following, say, the *a* tradition in the first part of the poem, the *β* tradition in the remainder, or, in some instances, showing in the same part alter-

nate use of the tradition of different groups. Perhaps, worthy of especial note is the curious and unfortunate circumstance that the only ms. (Philipps 8250, Cheltenham) which represents the  $\alpha$  text consistently throughout the whole poem is very corrupt, and, as Professor Root remarks, "stands at the end of a series of endless transcriptions." He himself indicates the above-mentioned Corpus Christi ms., of the  $\gamma$  group, as supplying the best basis for an edition of the poem. The  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  variants, however, would have to be added at the foot of the page and the readings of this  $\gamma$  text would have to be changed to  $\beta$  readings, wherever the latter are capable of sure determination.

I confess that this seems to me a curious *non sequitur* after all the writer's efforts to dethrone the  $\gamma$  mss. from their position of authority. It looks as if the beautiful workmanship of these mss. had in the end "tyrannized" over Professor Root's judgment as well as over Professor Skeat's. Surely, the natural conclusion from his own argument is that the best mss. of the  $\beta$  group should constitute the basis of a critical text.

It should be observed that Professor Root, as he tells us in his preface, inherited this task from Sir W. S. McCormick, who had to forego its execution, owing to duties of a different kind, and consequently, had the advantage of a considerable body of collations and notes which his predecessor had accumulated. The two scholars had already been associated in editing "Specimen Extracts" of the *Troilus* mss. for the Chaucer Society (First Series, No. 89), and so the undertaking represented by the present volume passed into appropriate hands.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE.

*University of Tennessee.*

---

*Shakespeare and the Founders of Liberty in America.* By CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917.

*A Heritage of Freedom.* By MATTHEW PAGE ANDREWS. New York, George H. Doran & Co., 1918.

Americans who lived in England before the war very soon came to realize the genuine heartiness of the interest taken by the English people in America and Americans. This declared itself not only in magnificent generosityes like the Rhodes Bequest and the

Atlantic Union, but even more significantly in the unfailing kindness and sympathetic questioning experienced by the touring bicyclist in corners where any suspicion of imperial politics would have been ridiculous. The historical explanation of this friendliness and the story of its international manifestations form the subject of Mr. Andrews' luminous little book. After sketching the parallel course and mutual development of ideals of freedom in England and America from the time Sir Edwin Sandys and his colleagues secured charters for the Virginia and New England colonies, Mr. Andrews reviews especially the relations between the two countries during the last hundred years of peace. Mr. Andrews is an American of Americans, whom it would be absurd to suspect of British partiality. His admirable statement of the plain facts shows that for the last three generations and more it has been as true of diplomatic connections as American travellers have found it in social dealings, that England has given in the cause of Anglo-American harmony a good deal more than she has received. Reasons for this are easy to find. Till the last decade those who lived in London attained naturally to a broader international vision than those who lived west of the Atlantic: Burke understood the colonies far better than Patrick Henry understood Parliament. The real American, moreover, was throughout the nineteenth century vastly more common in England than the real Briton in America.

Mr. Andrews' book—brief, well-documented, and plain-spoken as it is—should go far toward dispelling many heritages of error and awake us to a new understanding of that 'heritage of freedom' of which he writes. At this time, when so many Americans are endeavoring to pay the debt they owe to Sandys, Burke, and Bryce, as well as to Lafayette and Rochambeau, we may begin to look with hope to the day when the highest ideals of three centuries shall at last have ploughed their way to peace and truth

... 'through a cloud  
Not of war only, but detractions rude.'

Professor Gayley's volume develops the same theme. He likewise takes as his point of departure the work of Sandys and his 'Patriot party,' which under the menace of James I's absolutism sowed the seeds of free government simultaneously in America and in England; and he makes equally clear 'The Heritage in Com-

mon' between modern Britain and America. Professor Gayley's is a longer book, and he goes beyond the purely historical aspects of the case, exerting himself to show the fundamental unity of the political ideals of our race with the great literary movement of the sixteenth century. His detailed investigation of the personal and intellectual connection between Shakespeare and Hooker and the 'Founders of Liberty in America' appeals largely to technical students of English literature and contains a good deal which will be new to most of them. In *The Tempest* he finds evidences of a closer personal connection with the Virginia colonists than has been usually assumed; in *Troilus and Cressida* he traces the influence of the same articles of Hooker's political creed which guided the incorporators of the American commonwealths. The main truth which he brings out is, however, of universal application: the essential difference between a culture which is indigenous and really ideal and one arbitrarily superimposed upon an artificial political system. In his last two chapters the author's argument reaches a high eloquence. The fundamental necessity of Anglo-American concord he puts in three lines:

'For four generations we have been an independent people. But for six generations before that the intellectual and spiritual strivings of our British compatriots toward truth and freedom were those of the British in America.'

TUCKER BROOKE.

*Yale University.*

---

*The Pearl: An Interpretation.* By ROBERT MAX GARRETT. University of Washington Publications in English. Vol. IV, No. 1. Seattle, April 18, 1918. 45 pp.

Within the past few years much scholarly effort has been expended upon the interpretation of *The Pearl*, but it would seem that the problem has not yet lost its fascination. Professor Garrett, the most recent student to undertake the elucidation of the poem, does not concern himself directly with the question raised by Professor Schofield whether it is to be understood as an expression of personal bereavement or merely as a spiritual allegory. His primary purpose is to supply a new key to the symbolism of *The Pearl* by showing "that this poem has as its central idea the funda-

mental teachings of the Eucharist" (p. 10). Having announced this as his thesis, the author proceeds for sixteen pages to assemble testimony (1) as to the central importance and the inner meaning of the doctrine of the Eucharist in the fourteenth century; (2) as to the prominence of the pearl in the New Testament; and (3) as to the symbolic connection of the pearl with the Eucharist in patristic literature.

"The pearl," Professor Garrett declares, "is par excellence the precious stone of the New Testament."<sup>1</sup> The parable of the Pearl of Great Price was in itself sufficient to establish the pearl as a frequent symbol for Christ. To apply this symbol specifically to the consecrated wafer which represented the body of Christ would seem to be an easy extension of the figure. Professor Garrett lays stress upon the physical resemblances between the Host ("Hostia de frumento sit, rotunda et integra et sine macula") and a pearl which might have suggested this identification.

In point of fact, however, the figure of the pearl was almost never applied to the Host. The only instance of this figure which Professor Garrett has been able to find in the Western Church occurs in the verses of Venantius Fortunatus. The phrase *margaritum ingens* in these verses, by the way, was borrowed by Fortunatus from the *Psychomachia* (v. 873), where, however, it was not used of the Host.

Occasionally Professor Garrett's enthusiasm for pearls betrays him into observations which are somewhat fanciful, as when he remarks: "We are likely to see in the beautifully rounded limbs of children the likeness to pearls, in sheen and in color, in purity and in perfectness of form" (p. 24). The main criticism, however, which is to be passed upon these introductory sections of his discussion is that he overstrains the evidence in seeking to show that in patristic literature "the consecrated Host is the great Pearl of the sacred body of the Lamb" (p. 25).

Having completed his survey of the symbolism of the pearl in the Scriptures and in the Fathers, Professor Garrett proceeds to examine the Middle English poem in the endeavor to establish his thesis that its central theme is the Eucharist. Seven pages are devoted to a summary of the argument of the poem, but even this

<sup>1</sup>The further statement that "in the Old Testament the pearl does not occur at all" (p. 17) is inaccurate: see *Proverbs* 25, 12.



detailed summary does not enable the reader to perceive that the Eucharist plays any conspicuous part in the poet's plan. Indeed, the only explicit reference to the Eucharist occurs in the last half dozen lines of the poem (vv. 1205-1212). This passage, which is crucial to his argument, Professor Garrett translates in original fashion: "Upon this mound this lot I got, bowed down with grief for my Pearl, and then I entrusted it (*bis lote*) to God in Christ's dear blessing and memory, that in the form of bread and wine which the priest shows us every day, He gave us the way to become servants of his household and precious pearls unto His pleasure." (p. 32, n. 15).

Several points in this translation call for comment: (1) The antecedent of *hit* in p. 1207 is plainly *perle* and not *lote*: it is the Pearl whom the dreamer commits to God. (2) *Myn* (v. 1208) is the personal pronoun and not the substantive *mune*. (3) *þat* (v. 1209) must depend upon *Kryste* (v. 1208): it is Christ whom the priest exhibits daily in the form of bread and wine. (4) The last two lines have been understood by all previous translators as merely the conventional formula of benediction; emending *gef to gyue* in order to make sense of the passage. In any case Garrett's rendering—"He gave us *the way* to become servants of his household"—is unwarranted.

Professor Garrett's whole argument for the Eucharistic doctrine in *The Pearl* leans heavily upon this very dubious piece of translation. When he comes to his final statement of the case he stretches the interpretation of this passage to such an extent that it is positively misleading.

"To recapitulate: Within the frame of a great pearl, the poet sees his lost Pearl in the presence of the Lamb of God, a very member incorporate in the mystical body of Christ; *and she teaches him that through the grace of God as granted in the Eucharist it is given him to become a member of this body*, thus to be forever united with his Pearl as parts of the great pearl, the mystical body of Christ."

The phrases which I have italicized are left wholly without support if one accepts the usual translation of the lines with which the poem concludes. Even according to Professor Garrett's rendering of these lines it is notable that the maiden of the vision, who expounds at such length the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, offers no word of instruction to the dreamer concerning the

mystery of the Eucharist. His perception of this matter does not come until after she has left him.

Nor does one find it easy to accept Professor Garrett's further suggestion as to the origin and setting of the poem:

"I have an idea that the whole poem arose from gazing at the Elevated Host in the hands of the Priest (see frontispiece)—'round, white, like a pearl, the meeting place of heaven and earth—a pearl, Margaret'—something like this would, I think, be the train of thought which would bring the germ of the poem to him. I believe that the poet conceives the poem as taking place within the church where the Pearl might be buried, quite regardless of the convention of the arbor and the grass."

The song which floats to the poet (vv. 19-21) as he thinks of his lost Pearl is surely not "the chanting of the choir," nor is there a reference to the incense of the church service in the mention of the "spices" which spread above the little mound where his lost Pearl rests.

Professor Garrett adds to his study two Appendices. In Appendix A he dissents from Osgood's view that the poet in dating his vision "In Augoste in a hy3 seysoun" refers to the Feast of the Assumption. He proposes instead the Feast of the Holy Name of Jesus (August 7), the Feast of the Transfiguration (August 6), or the Feast of the First-fruits. On the other hand, "high season" is a term which would much more probably be applied to an important feast such as the Assumption; nor does the fact "that the Virgin gets very little mention in the poem" seem a sufficient reason for excluding this Feast from consideration.

Appendix B is a translation, first printed without name in *The Cowley Evangelist* in 1895, of St. Hilary's letter to his daughter concerning the robe and pearl which he was bringing her from the Prince. This is a singularly beautiful parable which deserves to be more widely known. Professor Garrett has rendered a useful service in making it accessible in this charming translation.

CARLETON BROWN.

*University of Minnesota.*

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### AN "HITHERTO UNKNOWN" ACTOR OF SHAKESPEARE'S TROUPE?

The well-known London firm of booksellers, Myers and Company, in its recent *Illustrated Catalogue of Rare Books*, 1918, offers for sale an autograph letter said to be "from one of the actors of Shakespeare's company." This letter, the *Catalogue* further states, is "not only valuable as giving the name of an hitherto unknown actor of Shakespeare's own time, but is one of the most interesting links with the great dramatist and actor that has recently come to light." Already the attention of Shakespearean scholars has been called to its importance by a writer in the *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, and in the future, no doubt, many students of the Elizabethan drama will be confronted with the claims here put forth.

From the two photographic facsimiles given in the *Catalogue*, I have deciphered the letter as follows. On the back, with the remains of the wax seal still clearly visible, is the address:

To my most deare &  
especeall good frend mr.  
Edward Alleyn at  
Dulwich dd thes

The letter itself, without date or further address, runs thus:

Right worshipfull, my humble dutie rememberd—hoping in the Almightye of yre health & prosperety, wch on my knees I beseeche him long to contyneue, ffor the many favors wch I haue from tyme to tyme received my poor abillity is not in the least degree able to give you satisfaction, vnless as I and myne haue byn bounden to you for yor many kyndnes soe will wee duringe life pray for yor prosperety. I confess I haue found you my cheifest frend in midst of my extremeties, wch makes me loath to presse or request yr favor any further, yet for that I am to be married on Sunday next, & yor kindnes may be a great help & furtherance vnto me towards the raisinge of my poore & deserted estate, I am enforced once agayne to entreat yor wopps furtherance in a charitable request, wch is that I may haue yor wopps Letter to mr Dowton<sup>1</sup> & mr Edward Juby<sup>2</sup> to be a meanes that the Company of players of the ffortune maie either offer at my wedding at St Saviors church, or of their owne good natures bestowe somthinge vppon me on that day. And as ever I and myne will not only

<sup>1</sup> So Henslowe, and others, usually spell the name, but he himself always wrote "Downton." He first appears in the list of the Admiral's Men in 1594; later he was associated with the unfortunate Pembroke's Company at the Swan; in 1597 he rejoined Henslowe, and later became the leader of the players at the Fortune.

<sup>2</sup> Edward Juby also first appears in the list of the Admiral's Men in 1594. After a long service with Henslowe, he became one of the chief players at the Fortune. He is referred to by Massye in 1613 as, apparently, the manager of the Fortune Company. He died, it would seem, in 1622.

rest bounden vnto yr [wopp] but contyneually pray for yr wopps health  
wth encreas of all happynes longe to contyneue. In hope of yr wopps favor  
herin, I humbly take my leave. Resting

yr worships during  
life to be commanded  
William Wilson.

According to the *Catalogue* (and the statements are repeated by the writer in the *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* in virtually the same words) this letter was "written by one of the actors of Shakespeare's company at the Fortune Theatre. . . . Next in importance to Shakespeare's own autograph must come any manuscript matter of his fellow actors and dramatists. Here we have an entire holograph letter from one of his actors, to the famous Shakespearean theatre owner, and founder of Dulwich College, mentioning Thomas Downton and Edward Juby, who were two of the most prominent English actors about the time of the publication of *Hamlet*. Downton, Juby, and Wilson must have all known Shakespeare well, and in all probability have often acted with him."

It is sufficient to say that Shakespeare was never connected in any way with the Fortune Playhouse, that Downton and Juby cannot be described as "Shakespearean actors," and that this letter has no real Shakespearean interest.

Yet the letter is not without interest as throwing light on the theatrical organization of the Fortune, and as further illustrating the kindly nature of that prince of men, Edward Alleyn. Possibly it once formed a part of the valuable Alleyn Papers at Dulwich College, many of which were dispersed at the end of the eighteenth century through the carelessness of scholars; and it should certainly find its permanent resting-place in the archives of that college.<sup>3</sup>

The letter is not dated, for that part of the address which the booksellers doubtfully read as the date ("apparently dated N. 1/16 '7") is the customary phrase "dd thes," meaning "deliver these."<sup>4</sup> The booksellers add, however: "It appears from the registers of St. Saviour's Church, Southwark, that William Wilson was married there, to Dorethea Seare, on Sunday, Nov. 2, 1617," and this clearly reveals the approximate date of the letter. I may add that Thomas Downton is believed to have retired from acting in 1618.

Is it possible, as has been suggested, that in William Wilson we have "an hitherto unknown" Elizabethan actor? I think it very doubtful. For some years I have been gathering all the available information about the numerous actors and other hangers-on at the

<sup>3</sup> Scholars should add this letter to Mr. W. W. Greg's *Henslowe Papers*, Appendix I, "Documents formerly belonging to the Dulwich collection, but not now known, together with some preserved elsewhere."

<sup>4</sup> For a similar address ending "thes dd" see J. P. Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, p. 177.

theatres before 1642, but my extensive collections fail to reveal any actor by this name. Nor does the letter imply that Wilson was an actor. On the contrary it implies, it seems to me, that he was not so important a person. Had he been a member of the company, he would not have been under the necessity of appealing thus to Alleyn (who had long retired from the active management of the playhouse); for his "fellows," we may be sure, among whom a fraternal spirit was highly developed,<sup>6</sup> would have needed no suggestion from Alleyn or any one else to remember his wedding in the proper way. Nor do I see any reason for supposing that this is the "Mr. Wilson, the singer" referred to in Alleyn's *Diary* in 1620:

Oct. 22. This daye was our weddinge daye, and ther dind with us Mr Knight, Mr Maund and his wife, Mr Mylor, Mr Jeffes, and two frendes with them, a preacher and his frend, Mr Wilson the singer, with others.<sup>7</sup>

I venture the suggestion that Wilson was one of the "gatherers," or money-collectors, of the playhouse, whose appointment was due to the kindness of Edward Alleyn. In 1612, Robert Browne wrote to Alleyn requesting him, as a matter of charity ("for he hath had many crosses, and it will be some comfort and help"), to appoint to "a gathering place" at the Fortune the wife of a certain Mr. Rose ("he hath been an old servant of mine, allwayes honest, trusty, and trew").<sup>7</sup> Again, about the year 1617, the actor William Bird wrote to Alleyn: "Sir, there is one Jhon Russell, that by yowr apoyntment was made a gatherer wth vs, but my fellowes [i. e. the actors], finding often falce to vs, haue many tymes warnd him from taking the box. And he as often, with most damnable othes, hath vowed neuer to touch; yet, notwithstanding . . . for wch we haue resolued he shall neuer more come to the doore; yet for yo<sup>r</sup> sake he shall haue his wages, to be a necessary attendaunt on the stage."<sup>8</sup> That these "gatherers" were numerous is indicated by the "Articles of Grievance against Mr. Henslowe," 1615, in which the actors accused him of "havinge 9 gatherers more than his due."<sup>9</sup>

If Wilson was not one of the "gatherers" at the Fortune, then in all probability he was one of the many "necessary attendants on the stage," whose appointment, we may suppose, had been the result of the kind-hearted interference of Alleyn.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS.

Cornell University.

<sup>6</sup> "My loving and kind fellows," writes the actor, John Underwood; and this was generally the spirit prevailing among the various troupes of London actors.

<sup>7</sup> Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, p. 153. Collier says: "It seems highly probable that this 'Mr. Wilson the singer' was no other than 'Jack Wilson, who personated Balthazar in *Much ado about Nothing*.'"

<sup>8</sup> W. W. Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, p. 63.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 89.



## MORE AND TRAHERNE

The source of Traherne's interest in the Platonic doctrine of the soul's recollection in early infancy of the felicities of a previous existence is naturally to be sought in the general revival of Platonism at Cambridge in the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Mr. Paul Elmer More<sup>1</sup> has already brought together the names of Thomas Traherne and Dr. Henry More as "products of the same Platonizing tendency" without, however, showing any immediate relation between these two exponents of the movement. Yet not only do external facts make possible such a relation, but internal evidence of striking similarity in thought and expression seems also to indicate that Traherne was indebted for much of his material to the learned author of the *Platonic Song of the Soul*.

Of Traherne's life enough is known to show that he may have had access to More's philosophical poems soon after their publication. *Psychologia, or the Life of the Soul* appeared in 1642, and the entire *Platonic Song of the Soul* in 1647. Traherne matriculated at Oxford in 1652, took his Bachelor's Degree in 1656, his Master's in 1661, and was made Bachelor of Divinity in 1669. While still at Oxford, then, Traherne may have combined his taste for divinity and poetry in the perusal of More's metaphysico-religious exposition of Platonism in the Spenserian stanza.

Such acquaintance becomes less purely conjectural upon an examination of the internal evidence found in the close resemblance in thought and language of the Cambridge Doctor and the Teddington recluse,—a resemblance shown in the following examples.

Contrasting the soul confined to bodily existence with its perfect freedom when relieved of its dependence upon the senses, More says:

Even so the soul in this contracted state  
 Confined to these strait instruments of sense,  
 More dull and narrowly doth operate,  
 At this hole hears, the sight must ray from thence,  
 Here taste, there smells; but when she's gone from thence  
 Like naked lamp she is one shining sphere,  
 All round about has perfect cognosence  
 Whatere in her horizon doth appear;  
 She is one Orb of sense, all eye, all airy ear.<sup>2</sup>

Compare with this Traherne's description of his soul while it was still free from the trammels of sense experience:

Then was my soul my only All to me,  
 A living endlesse eye,  
 Just bounded by the sky,  
 Whose power, whose act, whose essence was to see.  
 I was an inward *Sphere of Sight*,  
 Or an interminable Orb of *Light*,

<sup>1</sup> "Thomas Traherne," *The Nation*, 88:160 ff.

<sup>2</sup> More: *Complete Poems*, ed. Grosart. *Prae-existency of the Soul*, p. 128, st. 102.

An endless and a living day,  
 A vital sun that round did ray  
 All life, all sense,  
 A naked simple pure *Intelligence*.  
 For sight inherits beauty, Hearing sounds,  
 The nostril sweet perfume,  
 All *Tastes* have hidden rooms  
 Within the *Tongue*; and *feeling feeling* wounds  
 With pleasure and delight, but I  
 Forgot the rest, and all was Sight or Eye.<sup>3</sup>

Again, More shows the soul as knowing through immediate participation in reality:

. . . Her sight is tactual  
 The sun and all the stars that do appear,  
 She feels them in herself, can distance all,  
 For she is at each one purely presential.<sup>4</sup>

Traherne likewise conceives of his soul in early infancy as immediately knowing its environment by direct presentation:

It acts not from a centre to  
 Its object as remote,  
 But present is when it doth view,  
 Being with the being it doth note.

\* \* \*

This made me present evermore  
 With whatsoe'er I saw,  
 An object, if it were before  
 My eye, was by Dame Nature's Law,  
 Within my soul. Her store  
 Was all at once within me; all her treasures  
 Were my immediate and internal pleasures,  
 Substantial joys which did inform my mind.<sup>5</sup>

The obvious similarity noticed here suggests that Traherne was not merely a voice of his times, uttering doctrines that were more or less in the air, but that he was a disciple of the "most platonical of all the Platonists," who in "præ-existency" and memory independent of "corporalitie" provided Traherne with the means for the reconstructing of remembered or imagined joys of early infancy into recollections of a pre-natal state. Yet in spirit and method the two poets are far apart; for while More in rational exposition dogmatically sets forth the divine scheme of the universe, with man as its centre, its purpose, and its end, Traherne always retains in his "ego-centricity" something of the "first fine careless rapture" of his soul's early mystical experiences, so that his least lyrical moments are touched by a personal feeling that translates metaphysical subtleties into an emotional experience. For "All, all was mine."

GERTRUDE ROBERTS SHERER.

*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

<sup>3</sup> Traherne: *Poetical Works*, ed. Dobell. *The Preparative*, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Complete Poems: Immortality of the Soul*, Bk. III. st. 21.

<sup>5</sup> *Poetical Works: My Spirit*, p. 41.

## MARINO AND DANTE

There is somewhat of surprise at finding in one of the emptiest and vainest of Italian poets, reminiscences of the austere and most profound. Yet it is evident that in that poet to whom he alludes as

Altro, il cui volo pareggiar non lice.—*Adone*, ix, 178.

Giambattista Marino was letter-perfect, or was so at least in the *Inferno*, from which the majority of the allusions are drawn. His pages are strewn from end to end with tags and scraps of lines from the *Divine Comedy*, even as the latter is diversified with translated fragments of the *Aeneid*. A rather cursory reading of the *Adone* has revealed the examples listed below. A careful search would doubtless bring to light others. The edition of the *Adone* used was that published at Amsterdam in 1679. The citations from the *Divine Comedy* are from Moore's text, *Tutte le opere di Dante Alighieri*, Oxford, 1904.

Hor de gli occhi ribaccia il raggio ardente,  
Hor de la bocca il desiato riso.—*Adone*, III, 28.  
Quando leggemmo il disiato riso  
Esser baciato da cotanto amante.—*Inf.*, v, 133-34.

E con tai note  
Verga di pianto le lanose gote.—*Adone*, iv, 60.  
Quinci fur quete le lanose gote.—*Inf.*, III, 97.

Non giamai più forte  
Spranga legno con legno inchioda e stringe.—*Adone*, VIII, 60.  
Con legno legno mai spranga non cinse  
Forte così.—*Inf.*, XXXII, 49-50.

Nè lasciava d'andar, perch'ei parlasse.—*Adone*, x, 23.  
Non lasciavam l'andar perch'ei dicessi.—*Inf.*, iv, 64.

Gran fiamma secondar breve favilla  
Suole.—*Adone*, xi, 6.  
Poca favilla gran fiamma seconda.—*Par.*, I, 34.

Così repente in men che non balena.—*Adone*, xi, 173.  
E nascondeva in men che non balena.—*Inf.*, XXII, 24.

Così vuol chi quaggiù può quanto vuole.—*Adone*, XII, 155.  
Vuolsi così colà, dove si puote  
Ciò che si vuole.—*Inf.*, III, 95-96.

E non trahere ancora . . .  
L'alma infelice a riveder le stelle.—*Adone*, XIII, 70.  
E quindi uscimmo a riveder le stelle.—*Inf.*, XXXIV, 139.

Amor (che tutto regge e tutto move).—*Adone*, XIV, 222.  
La gloria di colui che tutto move.—*Par.*, I, 1.

Amor, che 'n gentil cor ratto s'apprende.—*Adone*, XIV, 253.  
Amor, che al cor gentil ratto s'apprende.—*Inf.*, v, 100.

The other examples noted reveal a similarity in thought rather than in wording.

Pur giova a molti antivedere il danno.—*Adone*, XI, 170.

Chè saëtta previsa vien più lenta.—*Par.*, XVII, 27.

Havrian veggendo in me maggior tormenti

Qualche conforto *le perdute genti*.—*Adone*, XIX, 228.

(Per me si va tra *la perduta gente*.—*Inf.*, III, 3.)

Chè alcuna gloria i rei avrebber d'elli.—*Inf.*, III, 42.

RUTH SHEPARD PHELPS.

University of Minnesota.

### M. H. G. *alrüne*

The Middle High German word for 'mandrake,' *alrüne*, being but rarely found in M. H. G. literature,<sup>1</sup> it seems worth while to call attention to an instance not yet recorded in our M. H. G. dictionaries, though it occurs in a well known text.

I am referring to the second scene of the Easter play of Muri (in Switzerland),<sup>2</sup> in which the *paltenære* (vendor, itinerant apothecary) praises his drugs and tonics:

Wā nu die choufen wellent?  
mich wundert daz si twellent.  
die minnære geile  
die vintent hie veile  
bibergeil, *alrüne*.  
si mun wol wesen slüne  
die daz niht went gewinnen  
dā von si vrouwen minnen.

'Where now are they that intend to make purchases? I am wondering that they can hesitate. Ardent lovers will find here for sale castoreum and mandrake. They must (*mun* = *mugen*) indeed be in a hurry who do not want (*went* = *welnt*, *wellent*) to gain the love of women.'

The fact that *alrüne* here appears associated with *bibergeil*, implies that the mandrake root is to serve as an ingredient of a love potion or a love powder. This use is in accordance with the glosses *friedelwurz* and *minnewurz* mentioned by Starck, p. 30.

I am making use of this opportunity to add to Dr. Starck's interesting discussion (pp. 52-57) of the mandrake in German literature another reference to a passage which I noticed recently.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. T. Starck, *Der Alraun* (Ottendorfer Memorial Series, No. 14, 1917), p. 52. Starck had to be satisfied with quoting the two stanzas by Heinrich von Meissen ('Frauenlob') referred to (s. v. *alrüne*) in Müller-Zarncke's *Mhd. Wtb.*

<sup>2</sup> Critical edition by K. Bartsch: "Das älteste deutsche Passionsspiel," *Germania* VIII (1863), 273-297. A reprint of Bartsch's text is found in K. Froning, *Das Drama des Mittelalters* I (= Kürschner's *Dt. Nat. Lit.*, vol. 14, I), pp. 228-244.

In a letter to Friederike Oeser, dated Febr. 13, 1769,<sup>3</sup> Goethe writes: "Zwey Jahre bey nahe, binn ich in Ihrem Hause herumgegangen, und ich habe Sie fast so selten gesehen, als ein Nachforschender *Magus* einen Alraun pfeifen hört." The meaning here of the words "einen Alraun pfeifen hört" (the verb *pfeifen* used in the sense of *quieken*, i. e., einen schrillen Ton von sich geben) is best illustrated by a line in *Romeo and Juliet* (IV, 3, 47):

And shrieks like mandrakes', torn out of the earth,

and similar passages from English literature quoted by Starck, pp. 51 and 52.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### OLD FRENCH *terne*, *ternir*

There has been considerable doubt regarding the etymology of Old French *terne*, *ternir* and consequently of the Eng. 'tarnish' which is derived from the latter. The etymon given by most dictionaries is the Old High German *tarni*, which was first proposed by Diez. One of the objections to this form has been the late appearance of the French words. The earliest examples cited by Godefroy, Littré and the *Dictionnaire Général* are from works of the fifteenth century. The editor of the last-named publication states that the relatively recent date of the French words renders doubtful their connection with the OHG. *tarni*. The same objection is raised in the *New English Dictionary* in a discussion of the source of 'tarnish.' The earliest example given of the latter dates from 1598.

In preparing an edition of the Old French poem, *La Vie de Ste. Euphrosine*, I have discovered the form *ternie* in the best manuscript of that work, the famous Canon. Misc. 74 of the Bodleian Library at Oxford. This manuscript has been described by Paul Meyer,<sup>1</sup> who dates it in the first years of the thirteenth century. The poem itself was probably written not later than 1200. The passage which concerns us is as follows:

U est la blanche face? Mut est descolerie,  
La vostre bele boche mut est ternie et palie. Vv. 1165, 6.

The second verse is metrically imperfect, but may be corrected by omitting *mut*, which may well be a scribal repetition of the form in the preceding verse. Another emendation would be to retain

<sup>3</sup> *Goethe's Werke*, Weimar edition, Abt. IV. (Briefe), Bd. I, p. 190, or *Der junge Goethe*, Neue Ausg., Bd. I (1909), p. 318.

<sup>1</sup> *Documents manuscrits*, pp. 145-150.



*mut* and read *terne*. However, the past participles *descolerie* and *palie* render *terne* preferable. Whichever solution be adopted, it is evident that either *terne* or *terne* was used in Old French as early as 1200, more than two centuries before the earliest examples cited up to this time. Thus one objection to the derivation from OHG. *tarni* is removed. In the example quoted above *ternir* has its usual meaning, 'to lose the brilliancy of color.' It is therefore more or less synonymous with *descolerie* (cf. *desculuret e pale*, *Roland*, 1979).

Other objections to deriving the word from OHG. *tarni*, both on account of the form and the meaning, have been voiced by Bugge (*Rom.* iv, 366). According to him, the etymon proposed by Diez does not satisfy, because most of the Germanic words adopted in French have been borrowed through the intermediary of the Frankish, where initial *t* > *d*, so we should expect *tarni* > *darne*. However, it is not necessary to suppose that all French words of Germanic origin are borrowed in this way. There are quite a number of French words undoubtedly of Germanic origin in which initial *t* has been preserved; such are *tette* (Germ. *titta*), *tique* (Germ. *tick*), *tarir* (Germ. *tharrjan*), etc. The existence of these and other forms shows that Germ. initial *t* may remain *t* in the French derivative.

The other reason for not connecting *terne* with *tarni* is that the latter means 'covered up,' 'veiled'; cf. *tarn-hut*, *tarn-kappe* = 'a mantle which renders invisible.' Yet the transition of meaning to a special application to light or color is not great. A 'veiled' light becomes a 'pale' light, brilliance when covered becomes 'dimmed.' It is not so much the question of a change of meaning, but rather the restriction to a particular limited use.

Another etymon proposed by Scheler and favored by Bugge is \**tetrinus* < *teter*. As far as the meaning is concerned, this seems to me less satisfactory than the one we have discussed. The regular signification of Lat. *taeter* is 'offensive,' 'foul,' 'repulsive.' In Late Latin, to be sure, it sometimes means 'dark.' However, the OF. *terne* has primarily the meaning of 'without color,' 'pale,' 'wan,' as in the passage already quoted, rather than that of 'repulsive,' or 'dark.'

Whether all the arguments in favor of deriving *terne*, *ternir* from *tarni* be accepted or not, it is certain that *ternir* was used in French as early as 1200, and that at that time it had the same meaning it has today.

RAYMOND THOMPSON HILL.

Yale University.

STRAY NOTES ON *Othello*

(1) I, iii, 219: 'pierced.' *Emendatio incertissima*: 'sierced'? Sierced = searsed = searched = probed = healed. In Malory, e. g., the process of 'searching' a wound often seems to stand, by synecdoche, for the result of the process: i. e., not merely 'probing' (the usual gloss), but rather really 'healing' or 'curing' seems to be the meaning intended. And cf. *Two Gentlemen*, I, ii, 116.

(2) II, iii, 124: 'To the platform, masters; come, let's set the watch.' Several critics, apparently including Furness, would have Montano enter here, just in time to witness Cassio's unsteady exit, instead of at line 65, on the ground that it would be improper for him to be 'tippling with people already flustered, and encouraging a subaltern officer, who commands a midnight guard, to drink to excess' (Steevens). But Montano had just been relieved of all responsibility; he was associating with the two men next in rank to Othello himself—the so-called 'subaltern officer' being Othello's chief-of-staff and actually, in due time, Othello's and Montano's successor as Governor of Cyprus; the proclamation (II, ii) commanded 'every man' to 'put himself into triumph,' with 'full liberty of feasting' till eleven o'clock, and Montano could hardly, with good grace, refrain from celebrating his successor's arrival and 'nuptial' as well as 'the mere perdition' of the enemy; Othello (II, iii, 2, 3) expressly countenanced some degree of indulgence on Cassio's part; and Montano (II, iii, 68) did not consider Cassio 'already flustered,' and was not 'encouraging' him 'to drink to excess' because quite unaware of his unusual susceptibility (II, iii, 34-44): accordingly, feeling himself far short of undue exhilaration, Montano very innocently and properly joined in the conviviality of the moment and naturally saw no harm in the relaxation of the others.

(3) III, iii, 14-18. Is not the dramatic necessity for this somewhat cumbrous and involved passage to be found in Emilia's speech, III, i, 44-53,—apparently two whole scenes away, but actually only twenty-five lines before, and therefore very fresh in the audience's memory? For after Emilia's positive affirmation of Othello's intention to take Cassio back into his favor and service, some such emphatic exposition of motives and contingencies is indispensable here in order to justify to the audience Cassio's personal appeal for Desdemona's intercession.

(4) IV, i, 245: 'Are you wise?' Furness quotes and supports Fechter's suggestion that this question should be spoken by Iago, aside, to Othello, in an effort to avert the impending outbreak which will only too probably jeopardize the success of all the Ensign's plotting. Certainly its form is perfectly appropriate for such a purpose, while it is mere tame anticlimax in Othello's mouth after his explosive ejaculation two words before. Furness fails to remark

the further argument for this emendation: after all Othello's genuine exclamations (lines 238, 245*a*, 249, 250), Desdemona answers him directly, in the second person, on the supposition that he has addressed her; here, on the contrary, even though a direct question is asked, she uses the third person, manifestly questioning someone else who has intervened between herself and Othello. Fechter directs Iago, while uttering these words, to seize the arm of Othello and stop him violently: some such action seems necessarily presupposed by the form of Desdemona's question. The only argument brought forward for retaining the present accepted arrangement of the text would seem to be this: Othello must speak this line in order to render intelligible his exclamation in line 250, 'I am glad to see you mad' (i. e., not wise); but line 250 remains perfectly intelligible even if the question in line 245 be transferred to Iago, for then Othello would simply be saying, in the bitterness of his anguish, 'I am glad to see you so brazenly casting discretion to the winds by acting so madly, for it settles my doubts and nerves me for the execution of my dreadful duty.'

(5) iv, ii, 145-147. Professor A. C. Bradley (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, 215) comments on this passage thus: '[Iago] was also unreasonably jealous; for his own statement that he was jealous of Othello is confirmed by Emilia herself, and must therefore be believed.' Surely this kind of criticism does a double injustice to Iago. In the first place, it misunderstands him by trying to make him out to be something that he really was not. For the logic is viciously fallacious: we might just as well say, 'Iago was unreasonably honest; for his own repeated statements that he is honest are confirmed by the repeated statements of everyone else.' No, the man who could jest about personal honor so cynically even to Emilia herself (III, iii, 302) can hardly be believed to have had any very sensitive feelings about marital fidelity. Moreover, to explain away Iago's machinations, or find a serious cause for them, on the ground of mere jealousy is to derogate as much from his greatness as is done in the parallel case of Hamlet when the heart of his mystery is glibly explained away on the ground of madness. In the second place, Professor Bradley's criticism underestimates Iago by not making him out to be something that he really was. Surely the strange 'and' for 'for' in 'I hate the Moor; And it is thought abroad, that 'twixt my sheets' (I, iii, 392, 393) was deliberately designed to give the line a casually incidental tone and show that it was really an afterthought, due to 'motive-hunting'; so also the strange parenthesis 'For I fear Cassio with my nightcap too' (II, i, 316). These cases supply the clue to the explanation of Emilia's 'confirmation' of Iago's alleged jealousy of Othello. In all three instances is it not giving Iago only due credit for the subtlety that we know to have been his, if we believe that he was practising his rôle, rehearsing to himself or to Emilia the reasons that would plausibly justify his actions, and in the

'Cassio' inspiration trying out an idea that he might subsequently use in arguing Othello into acquiescence—just as he threw out offhand a suspicion of Bianca (v, i, 85, 105) on the chance that it might prove useful later? Were not these groundless accusations against Othello and Cassio just Iago's way of experimenting on Emilia and himself in the workings of this unknown quantity, jealousy? And might not the 'Cassio' line be interpreted thus, retaining the original punctuation: 'I'll . . . Abuse him to the Moor in the rank garb (*On the ground that I fear Cassio with my night-cap too, as well as with his*)'? If so, Iago was here going over *verbatim* the speech that was to undo Othello: he was willing to besmirch his own wife's fair name in order to attain his object, viz., convince Othello of his sincerity and honesty. Professor Bradley's interpretation (see also his Note Q, p. 441) misses this fiendish subtlety, just as it too credulously characterizes Iago as jealous.

LAWRENCE MASON.

Yale University.

---

#### THE COVENT-GARDEN JOURNAL EXTRAORDINARY

Some years ago in looking over the *General Advertiser* for Monday, January 20th, 1752, I found advertised for "this day at noon" THE COVENT-GARDEN JOURNAL EXTRAORDINARY, NUMB. I, Printed for J. SHARP, near *Temple-Bar*; but until recently no copy of this pamphlet has come to light. Now, thanks to the diligence of Mr. F. S. Dickson, of New York City, a unique and excellent copy has been added to the splendid Fielding Collection in the Yale Library.

It is a curious burlesque of Henry Fielding's *Drawcansirian* periodical, and is (as I conjectured in my edition of the *Covent-Garden Journal*, I, 57) written in an unfriendly humor. There is a leader of three pages in *Drawcansir's* manner (even to the extent of using *hath* uniformly) which takes up, using Fielding's historical method, the subject of transmigration of souls with particular reference to "a Vagabond metamorphosed into a Justice, and a Cook-maid [who has succeeded] to the Honours of her Mistress." Fielding's enemies took particular delight in ridiculing his assumption of the office of "trading Justice" and his second matrimonial venture. Page four has a burlesque *Journal of the War* in which Smollett is definitely referred to as head of a "flying Party" which still kept the field after Sir Alexander [Fielding] had declared a peace. A reconnoitering party finds "a small Hutt" [Smollett], and reference is made to a "northern Free-booter" who had "lately assaulted" Fielding [in *A Faithful Narrative*, January 15th].

On page five is an advertisement in which Fielding is represented as denying one of the charges made in Smollett's *Narrative*. He denies that he had been a "Herald" to a "Collection of Wild Beasts" and had publicly solicited patronage "at the Door of any House, Barn, or Booth" *except* as he had been concerned as "Author, Stroller and Puppet-show man." Possibly the author of this burlesque shared the popular error which confused Timothy Fielding with Henry in the former's theatrical venture in a booth at Bartholomew Fair.

On the same page is an account of *Amelia's* death and burial, and as in every similar attack, reference is made to the noseless condition of Fielding's heroine. Page six refers to the "Sentence of Damnation on his *Wedding-Day*" some years before at the Drury-Lane, and comments on Garrick's strange adherence to the man who had involved him in that unsuccessful production. Finally, on the same page, there is an adroit reference to "the female Champion," Roxana Termagant, who had recently declared war (in her *Drury-Lane Journal*) against Sir Alexander Drawcansir. The passage speaks of Roxana as "a *Smart* old woman" who has taken offense at Drawcansir's invasion of her "Province of Gossiping" and "Caudle-making." This is an attempt to attribute the *Drury-Lane Journal* to Christopher Smart, who was at that time offering the public Mary Midnight's *Caudle*.

The author of this pamphlet was probably Bonnell Thornton, but the fact that J. Sharp published Smollett's *Faithful Narrative* and this later parody as well gives some ground for suspecting Smollett. A careful examination of the work reveals some slight evidence that Thornton is its author, and none whatever that Smollett wrote it. In the first place, I doubt very much if Smollett would introduce himself in such a burlesque on his own intervention in the Paper War. Moreover, Smollett's *Faithful Narrative* reveals his inability to write in any such vein as this later production reveals. Thornton, however, could do just this sort of thing, and later in four separate instances publishes in his *Drury-Lane Journal* similar burlesques with exactly the same title. In the second issue of his *Journal* three days after the publication of this first parody, Thornton, who attacked anybody and everybody, attacked Smollett for his inclusion of Lady Vane's memoirs in *Peregrine Pickle*—a second stone from the same hand directed at the same bird. Finally, in the peculiar profusion of dashes throughout this parody I find, with a slight variation, a customary habit of Thornton's pen. Smollett is very chary of his dashes—so, too, are Kenrick, Hill, and the author of *Old England*—other possible writers of this pamphlet. But by way of disproof I must admit that Thornton rarely uses the dash to replace the full stop as does the printer of this amusing burlesque.

The importance of the discovery is threefold: first of all, we



find a direct statement that Smollett was actively engaged in the Paper War, and our opinion that he was the author of *A Faithful Narrative* is further strengthened; secondly, we find that in Fielding's lifetime his enemies referred to his having a booth at Bartholomew Fair; and, thirdly, we discover a source for the opinion expressed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (January, 1752, p. 29) that Mrs. Midnight (Smart) was the author of the *Drury-Lane Journal*.

GERARD E. JENSEN.

Wells College.

### BRIEF MENTION

*The Foundations and Nature of Verse.* By Cary F. Jacob (New York, Columbia University Press, 1918). The official record of the University of Virginia reports this work to have been accepted, in 1917, as a doctoral dissertation. It is a book, however, that represents so much minute study in different directions as to exceed the average achievement within the period of the usual academic course. Both form and content betray a certain maturity in training which is accounted for, at least in part, in an incidental appeal (p. 118) to the writer's "own experience, gained through eight years of very careful study of music from the point of view of both performer and composer." This statement throws required light on the character of the treatise. The subject is considered from the musical point of view, without a corresponding evaluation of linguistic principles. It is plain that the writer is more advanced in the study of music than in the study of the science and art of language. This is in striking variation from the usual equipment of the prosodist, and it results in an excess of stress on the points of agreement between music and poetry. In the other pan of the scales is the excess of stress on the relation between poetry and prose,—an excess that is now so much in favor that it has become timely to commend its opposite error, if we may hope, by a Nichomachean method, to lead to the truth at some middle point.

The musician and the poet do not employ the same 'language,' tho there is a mathematical basis that is common to both arts. Music is in the closer and the more consistent touch with the laws of physics; and being inarticulate it is allied to primitiveness and is not, in strict logic, amenable to analytic thought. Poetry has the remoter relation to physics of articulate language, the agency for the analysis and definite expression of thought and emotion. Its closest alliance is with reflection upon human experience, with exactness in the use of significant words, with symbolism that is concrete and intellectually articulated so as to be unmistakable in definiteness of meaning. These arts differ in their use of rhythm.

In the one rhythm is carried to a high pitch of precision, in the other it is employed with a flexibility that would be detrimental to the first. This is the inevitable consequence of the described difference in 'language.' When, therefore, the discussion turns on 'regularity' of rhythm, poetry must not be held amenable to the strict laws of a melody in music, but the rhythm of poetry must be understood to be subject to the modifications and modulations of speech-utterance. The rhythm of poetry is not on this account to be described as irregular; it is regular, not in the absolute terms of the physicist, but in a manner that represents an agreeable and artistic pulsation of the particular language in which it is composed. The rhythms of poetry being conditioned by the character of the language employed, the error is to be avoided of not attending minutely to this 'grammar,' which is the key to the proper formulation of the principles of the poet's art of versification.

The arts of music and poetry differ from each other still more widely in their relation to the physical properties of sound. The alphabet of music is the conventionalized scale of pitch; in poetry as in language generally, pitch is at most a component of rhythmic stress or rhetorical emphasis. Music avails itself in a definite manner of loudness; poetry does not. Tone-quality, as the physicist describes it, is an important element in both these arts, which are, however, sharply separated by a difference in fundamental relation to this element. This difference is as wide as that which distinguishes the physical constitution of the vowel-sounds and the employment of rime and its cognate devices from musical instrumentation. Again, melody and harmony are admirable terms to describe effects in poetry, which are as capable of clear definition in this art as in the art from which the terms have been borrowed; but the definitions show the difference between the tonal-art and the linguistic art.

What is to be learned by comparing and contrasting these arts is made clear in the methods by which they are severally acquired. Elementary training in music proceeds from rudiments that are physical and mechanical to a degree that widely separates the process from the initial steps in poetry, which are amenable to the demands of correctness in language, taste in conforming to rules of artistic expression, and the exercise of the imagination; and to meet these demands the beginner in poetic composition has an outfit in the possession of the practical art of his vernacular. Finally, to look at the matter from a very different angle, competent criticism of a musical composition turns upon technicalities that are quite distinct from the principles governing the criticism of poetry.

Prosodists, as a class, err in either slighting the analogies between music and poetry, or in pushing these analogies too far. As usual, the *via media* is the true course; that is the implied meaning of the foregoing statements, which are to direct attention to the incontro-

vertible ground for the doctrine—trite enough—that the science of versification has its foundation in the principles of language rather than in the physics of a tonal-art. The poetic art (on the formal side) of a language is determined by the artistic possibilities in the use of that language and that language alone. Puttenham attributed the beauty of Greek and Latin poetry to the use of quantitative ‘feet,’ and added: “which feete we have not, nor as yet never went about to frame (the nature of our language and words not permitting it), we have instead thereof twentie other curious points in that skill more than they [the ‘ancients’] ever had, by reason of our rime and tunable concords or simphonie, which they never observed. Poesie, therefore, may be an art in our vulgar, and that a verie methodicall and commendable.”

Puttenham argued the possibility of an art of English poetry by insisting on the availability of artistic elements in the language, which must be, he contends, reducible “into a method of rules and precepts.” Poetry, he declared, is a “vulgar art,” that is, an artistic use of the vernacular; and English, no less surely than Greek and Latin, can be used artistically, and from this use a corresponding system of rules and conventionalities is deducible. The argument is conclusive that as the poetic use of the language of antiquity is conditioned by the peculiar character and properties of these languages, so must the poetic use of English be in conformity with the peculiar constitution of English, which the artist must understand in all its “curious points” and “tunable concords.” The science of the poetic art, especially on its formal side, is to be based, therefore, on the laws and peculiarities of language, and under divisions that are made necessary by differences in the character of the languages employed. One must insist, even if it be in this repetitious manner, on the basic difference between music and poetry, and require of the prosodist complete training in linguistic principles.

Dr. Jacob’s book must not, by the foregoing implications, be undervalued. His scholarly acumen and industry is shown in every chapter, and the reader will thank him for following the approved method in supporting his historic survey of one and another subject by exact bibliographic citations. On the other hand, there is to be no abatement of the implied restrictions of the book. Its dominant character is due to an excess of the technicalities that relate more directly to tonal-art. But the prosodist will be benefitted by Dr. Jacob’s review of the scientific investigations of the elements of “Noise and Tone” (chap. II), “Pitch” (chap. III), “Tone Quality” (chap. IV), “Time” (chap. VIII), “Duration” (chap. X), “Accent” (chap. XI), to mention only those that offer the strongest temptations to confuse one art with another. Dr. Jacob is not deficient in fine perceptions of the effects of versification; but lacking adequate knowledge of the inner character of the language, he often arrives at the right conclusion for a wrong reason. Thus, in the discussion of what is misnamed the pyrrhic foot (pp. 136 ff.),

for there is no pyrrhic foot in English versification, an apprehension of the rhythmic accents of the language would have led directly to the right conclusion. So too is an essential feature of versification denied in this summary: "Prose, verse, and music are continuous in their flow. All such devices as writing them in lines and supplying them with various marks of punctuation are entirely aside from their structure. . . . In verse the logical group is also the rhythmical group, whether the grouping is indicated by any form of punctuation or not" (p. 167). The confusion that results from denying that the line is a structural unit and from insisting on "logical grouping" divests the discussion of "Rhyme and the Line" of valid reasoning with respect to versification. Later on the continuous flow of prose is correctly described as being not a rhythmic flow; and "highly oratorical, dithyrambic prose" is duly distinguished from the usual form. As a second transition product, *vers libre* is also to be thus marked off. It is described as "an interspersing of snatches of verse with loose combinations of prose" (p. 207). In the same connection is treated the flow of music and poetry. Here Dr. Jacob admits all that is demanded by the advocate of strictness in the employment of devices to maintain rhythmic patterns, and then, with surprising disregard of the essential character of an art, dismisses these structural devices as being "conventions pure and simple."

This book is not lightly to be put aside. It represents a wide range of study, from the history of the musical scale to the rhythm of prose, with a commendable effort to make available for the prosodist pertinent results in the sciences of physics and psychology. On the æsthetic side of the subject of versification, which is not primarily in the mind of the author, discriminating observations will be found, and these will easily be made to yield a fuller import when considered in the light of the basic fact of the character of the language, and of the traditions of its artistic use. J. W. B.

---

*Robert Burns: How to Know Him.* By W. A. Neilson (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1917) is, with the possible exception of Professor Sherman's *Arnold*, the best book that has appeared in this popular series. Burns has suffered in criticism from over-praise, boisterous defence of his irregularities, and misinterpretation, mystical or otherwise. President Neilson is influenced neither by Carlyle nor by Henley. He keeps to the middle road of accurate and wide scholarship; places Burns in his historical position as the last and greatest of the line of Scots lyrists; and touches delicately, with neither vulgarity nor glossing, upon the personal side of his career. The chapter on Burns's "Inheritance: Language and Literature" is brief and of course elementary, but it is a most admirable introduction to the subject. The succeeding

chapter on "Burns and Scottish Song" could not be bettered. The plan of the series includes an anthology of each writer. President Neilson has chosen his groups of poems with exquisite taste so as to illustrate each section of his study. The marginal glossary throughout the book will be of assistance to those coming to Burns for the first time.

S. C. C.

*Death and Liffe: An Alliterative Poem.* Ed. with Introd. and Notes by James Holly Hanford and John M. Steadman, Jr. (*N. C. Studies in Philol.* xv. 2, July, 1918). Professor Hanford's Introduction includes a valuable discussion of the Debate-Form in general and of the Conflict of Death and Life as it is represented in medieval literature. His own special researches in the field of the Medieval Debate abundantly qualify him to supply in this way the materials which underlie this particular poem. So far as the sources and date of *Death and Liffe* are concerned, Professor Hanford for the most part restates and elaborates conclusions already presented by Miss Edith Scamman (*Radcliffe Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit.* xv) and by himself in his paper, "Dame Nature and Lady Liffe" (*Mod. Philol.* xv). He follows Miss Scamman and Professor Manly in rejecting the view of Skeat that *Death and Liffe* was written by the author of *Scotish Feilde*. In his opinion *Death and Liffe* is to be assigned to the first half of the fifteenth century. Among the immediate sources of the poem he recognizes not only *Piers Plowman* but also *Winnere and Wastoure*, *The Parlement of Thre Ages*, and Alanus de Insulis in *De Planctu Naturae*.

In reprinting the text of the poem Mr. Steadman made an independent collation of the manuscript from rotographs; but beyond the restoration of line 448, which was omitted from the Hales-Furnivall edition (as Prof. York Powell first noted in 1884), it cannot be said that this collation has resulted in any important corrections of the earlier print. This is hardly a matter of surprise, however, since the accuracy of Dr. Furnivall's transcripts has long been a tradition. In several instances, indeed, the Furnivall print appears to be more accurate than Steadman's. Thus:

STEADMAN	FURNIVALL
7. blytheness	blythenesse
181. selclothes	selcothes
222. comandeth	commandeth
264. comandement	commandement
322. & the soothe	& soothe
324. with	with
388. worse	worsse
392. <i>King</i>	<i>King</i>
423. Isaac	Isacc

In line 336 Furnivall's punctuation, *lille,/when* is unquestionably



right instead of *litle./When*. In the foot-note on *pratinge* (259) the statement that "F. reads *prasinge*" is erroneous.

The Glossary contains a number of slips, both editorial and typographical. The troublesome word *bine* (254) is certainly a substantive and not an adverb, so that the citation of *byne* from *Floris and Blancheflour* is beside the point. It might conceivably be a form of *binne* (cf. also *binge*), but the sense of the passage would be clearer if one regarded the word as a corruption of *bune*, *buine* (*emtio*, 'bargain'). In the definition of *creame* one should read *oleum* instead of *cleum*. The verb *dained* is clearly from O. Fr. *deigner*, and is not a clipped form of *ordain*. *Derffe* (380) is defined as "troublesome" (< O. E. *gedeorf*), whereas it is the same word as *derffe* in line 325, where it is rightly defined as "cruel." *Farden* (165) is vaguely defined as "fared, went, were." *Quintful* (155) means 'artful, crafty,' rather than "proud, haughty, delicate." *Sayd* (36 and 454) is defined: "became heavy (in sleep)," and in the Notes there is a misleading citation of the line from the *Destruction of Troy*: "þat all sad were on sleepe." The verb *sayd* has no possible connection with the adjective, but is a shortened form from O. Fr. *essayer*: its meaning is clearly illustrated in the line cited from *Child Waters*, "Where I may say a sleepe." Mr. Steadman appends twelve pages of Notes which materially assist the reader by referring him to similar passages in Middle English alliterative poetry. The obscure phrase, "& take away of thy winne word" (5) is queerly paraphrased: "to take to ourselves thy joyous word."

C. B.

#### NECROLOGY

In the death of Gustav George Laubscher, October 5, 1918, Romance scholarship has suffered a distinct loss. Professor Laubscher received his bachelor's degree from Adelbert College, and his doctor's degree, in 1909, from the Johns Hopkins University. From that time he held the chair of Romance languages in the Randolph-Macon Woman's College, a responsible post for a beginner. Its arduous duties did not prevent him, however, from continuing and developing his own studies. His dissertation on the Past Tenses in French is a scholarly piece of work. In recent years he had been gathering the materials for an investigation of the decline of case-inflection in French. As the study developed he saw that it must be divided into the history of the pronouns and of the nouns. Fortunately, the former is substantially complete and ready for publication; the latter is less advanced, altho the material is all gathered.

Laubscher was a sturdy, honest, and kindly nature; a man of promise, in whom promise was already merging into fulfilment.

E. C. A.